

PENNSYLVANIA

Ambrose S. Plummer, Elizabethtown.

TENNESSEE

John M. Whiteside, Bellbuckle.

Lula C. Beasley, Centerville.

Rennie G. Connelly, Lyles.

WYOMING

Flora Thomas, Grass Creek.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, April 7, 1924

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our blessed Heavenly Father, the light of another day has broken in upon us to reveal incomplete tasks. May we discover Thee in common day and in common duty. Then we shall know that they are sacred and divine. Bless us with Thy wisdom and make us conscious of Thy presence. Inspire us with a faith that never wavers and with a hope that never grows dim. O Lord, keep us wise and prudent, that we may enjoy the world without injury and life without wrong. For Thy name's sake. Amen.

The Journals of the proceedings of Saturday, April 5, 1924, and Sunday, April 6, 1924, were read and severally approved.

MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to file views of the minority on H. R. 7962.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to file the views of the minority on the bill referred to. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I have before me page 5646 of the RECORD. In reply to that I ask unanimous consent to insert some pictures by McManus, Sidney Smith, and Goldberg.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that is a matter which ought to be done by the consent of the Printing Committee.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. The order of business to-day is the Consent Calendar. The Chair, for the information of the House, will say that the only suspension which the Chair has in mind as to any bill not on the Consent Calendar is the one to fix the compensation of the officers and employees of the legislative branch of the Government. The Chair expects to recognize the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] to move to suspend the rules very early.

The Clerk will report the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

BRIDGE ACROSS ST. MARYS RIVER NEAR WILDS LANDING, FLA.

The first bill on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 6725) granting the consent of Congress to the States of Georgia and Florida, through their respective highway departments, to construct a bridge across the St. Marys River at or near Wilds Landing, Fla.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, since that matter was up for consideration before I have conferred with the Representatives of the two States concerned and with Senator FLETCHER, who has a similar bill pending in the Senate. As I understand, there is no objection to the bill being passed for the present; and I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed but retain its place on the calendar.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that the bill H. R. 6725 be passed but retain its place on the calendar. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

COMPENSATION OF OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass H. R. 8262, a bill to fix the compensation of officers and employees of the legislative branch of the Government.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois moves to suspend the rules and pass the bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

SECTION 1. The following positions and annual (except where specified otherwise) rates of compensation are hereby established:

SENATE

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

Secretary to the Vice President, \$4,200; clerk, \$1,940; assistant clerk, \$2,080; messenger, \$1,310.

CHAPLAIN

Chaplain of the Senate, \$1,520.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Secretary of the Senate, including compensation as disbursing officer of salaries of Senators and of contingent fund of the Senate, \$6,500; Assistant Secretary, Henry M. Rose, \$5,500; reading clerk, \$4,500; financial clerk, \$4,500; chief clerk, \$3,420; assistant financial clerk, \$3,600; minute and Journal clerk, \$3,600; principal clerk, \$3,150; librarian, \$3,000; enrolling clerk, \$3,150; printing clerk, \$3,000; executive clerk, \$2,890; file clerk, chief bookkeeper, and assistant Journal clerk, at \$2,880 each; first assistant librarian and keeper of stationery, \$2,780 each; assistant librarian, \$2,150; skilled laborer, \$1,520; clerks—3 at \$2,880 each, 2 at \$2,590 each, 1 \$2,460, 1 \$2,100, 1 \$1,770; assistant keeper of stationery, \$2,360; assistant in stationery room, \$1,520; messenger in library, \$1,310; special officer, \$2,150; assistant messenger, \$1,520; laborers—3 at \$1,140 each, 3 at \$1,010 each, 1 in stationery room, \$1,440.

DOCUMENT ROOM

Superintendent, \$3,500; first assistant, \$2,880; 2 clerks, at \$1,770 each; skilled laborer, \$1,520.

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

Clerks and messengers to the following committees: Agriculture and Forestry—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,150; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520. Appropriations—clerk, \$6,000; assistant clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$3,000; three assistant clerks, at \$2,700 each; two assistant clerks, at \$2,100 each; messenger, \$1,440. To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$1,940; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520. Banking and Currency—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,150; two assistant clerks, at \$1,830 each. Civil Service—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$1,940; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520. Claims—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,570; assistant clerk, \$2,360; two assistant clerks, at \$1,830 each. Commerce—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,590; assistant clerk, \$2,150; assistant clerk, \$1,830. Conference Minority of the Senate—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,150; two assistant clerks, at \$1,830 each. District of Columbia—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,480; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520. Education and Labor—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,150; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520. Enrolled Bills—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$1,940; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520. Expenditures in the Executive Departments—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$1,940; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520. Finance—clerk, \$3,600; special assistant to the committee, \$3,150; assistant clerk, \$2,590; assistant clerk, \$2,460; assistant clerk, \$1,940; two assistant clerks, at \$1,830 each; two experts (one for the majority and one for the minority), at \$2,360 each; messenger, \$1,520. Foreign Relations—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,590; assistant clerk, \$2,150; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520. Immigration—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,150; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520. Indian Affairs—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,570; assistant clerk, \$2,040; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520. Inter-oceanic Canals—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,150; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520. Interstate Commerce—clerk, \$3,300; two assistant clerks, at \$2,150 each; assistant clerk, \$1,830. Irrigation and Reclamation—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$1,940; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520. Judiciary—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,590; two assistant clerks, at \$2,150 each; assistant clerk, \$1,830. Library—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$1,940; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520. Manufactures—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,040; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520. Military Affairs—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,590; additional clerk, \$1,940; three assistant clerks, at \$1,830 each. Mines and Mining—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$1,940; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520. Naval Affairs—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,590; two assistant clerks, at \$1,830 each. Patents—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$1,940; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520. Pensions—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,150; four assistant clerks, at \$1,830 each. Post Offices and Post Roads—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,460; three assistant clerks, at \$1,830 each. Printing—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,150; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520. Privileges and Elections—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,040; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520. Public Buildings and Grounds—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$1,840; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520. Public Lands and Surveys—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,360; assistant clerk, \$2,150; two assistant clerks, at \$1,830 each. Revision of the Laws—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$1,940; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520. Rules—clerk, \$3,300, to

include full compensation for the preparation biennially of the Senate Manual under the direction of the Committee on Rules; two assistant clerks, at \$2,150 each; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520. Territories and Insular Possessions—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$1,940; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520.

CLERICAL ASSISTANCE TO SENATORS

Clerical assistance to Senators who are not chairmen of the committees specifically provided for herein, as follows: Seventy clerks at \$3,300 each, 70 assistant clerks at \$1,940 each, and 70 assistant clerks at \$1,830 each. Such clerks and assistant clerks shall be ex officio clerks and assistant clerks of any committee of which their Senator is chairman.

Seventy-one additional clerks at \$1,520 each, 1 for each Senator having no more than 1 clerk and 2 assistant clerks for himself or for the committee of which he is chairman.

OFFICE OF SERGEANT AT ARMS AND DOORKEEPER

Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, \$6,500; Assistant Doorkeeper, \$4,200; Acting Assistant Doorkeeper, \$4,200; 2 floor assistants, at \$3,600 each; messengers—5 (acting as assistant doorkeepers, including 1 for minority), at \$2,150 each; 38 (including 1 for minority), at \$1,770 each; 1, \$1,310; 1 at card door, \$1,940; clerk on Journal work for CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to be selected by the Official Reporters, \$2,800; storekeeper, \$2,740; stenographer in charge of furniture accounts and records, \$1,520; upholsterers and locksmith, \$1,770; cabinet-maker, \$1,520; 3 carpenters, at \$1,390 each; janitor, \$1,520; 5 skilled laborers, at \$1,310 each; laborer in charge of private passage, \$1,340; 3 female attendants in charge of ladies' retiring rooms, at \$1,240 each; 3 attendants to women's toilet rooms, Senate Office Building, at \$1,010 each; telephone operators—chief, \$2,040; 4, at \$1,200 each; night operator, \$1,010; telephone page, \$1,010; laborer in charge of Senate toilet rooms in old library space, \$950; press gallery—superintendent, \$2,740; assistant superintendent, \$1,840; messenger for service to press correspondents, \$1,240; laborers—3, at \$1,100 each; 34 at \$1,010 each; 21 pages for the Senate Chamber, at the rate of \$3.30 per day each, during the session.

Police force for Senate Office Building under the Sergeant at Arms: Sixteen privates at \$1,360 each; special officer, \$1,520.

POST OFFICE

Postmaster, \$2,740; chief clerk, \$2,150; 8 mail carriers and 1 wagon master, at \$1,520 each; 3 riding pages, at \$1,220 each.

FOLDING ROOM

Superintendent, \$1,940; foreman, \$1,940; assistant, \$1,730; clerk, \$1,520; folders—7 at \$1,310 each; 7 at \$1,140 each.

CAPITOL POLICE

Captain, \$2,150; 3 lieutenants, at \$1,520 each; 2 special officers, at \$1,520 each; 3 sergeants, at \$1,410 each; 44 privates, at \$1,360 each.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING

Clerk, \$4,000; inspector, \$2,490; stenographer, \$1,740.

OFFICE OF ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

Architect of the Capitol, \$6,000; chief clerk and accountant, \$3,150; civil engineer, \$2,770; construction draftsman, \$2,360; 2 clerks, at \$1,520 each; laborers—2 at \$1,010 each, 2 at \$950 each; forewoman of charwomen, \$760; 21 charwomen, at \$410 each; 48 elevator conductors, at \$1,520 each.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

OFFICE OF THE SPEAKER

Secretary to the Speaker, \$4,200; clerk to the Speaker's table, \$3,600, and for preparing Digest of the Rules, \$1,000 per annum; clerk to the Speaker, \$1,940; messenger to the Speaker's table, \$1,520; messenger to the Speaker, \$1,440.

CHAPLAIN

Chaplain of the House of Representatives, \$1,520.

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

Clerk of the House of Representatives, including compensation as disbursing officer of the contingent fund, \$6,500; Journal clerk, and 2 reading clerks, at \$4,200 each; disbursing clerk, \$3,570; tally clerk, \$3,470; file clerk, \$3,420; enrolling clerk, \$3,200 and \$1,000 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; property custodian and superintendent of furniture and repair shop, who shall be a skilled cabinetmaker or upholsterer and experienced in the construction and purchase of furniture, \$3,600; 2 assistant custodians at \$3,000 each; chief bill clerk, \$3,150; assistant enrolling clerk, \$2,880; assistant to disbursing clerk, \$2,780; stationery clerk, \$2,570; librarian, \$2,460; assistant librarian, \$2,240; assistant file clerk, \$2,250; assistant librarian, and assistant Journal clerk, at \$2,150 each; clerks—1 \$2,150, 3 at \$2,020 each; bookkeeper, and assistant in disbursing office, at \$1,940 each; 4 assistants to chief bill clerk, at \$1,830 each; stenographer to the Clerk, \$1,730; locksmith and typewriter repairer, \$1,620; messenger and clock repairer, \$1,520; assistant in stationery room, \$1,520; 3 messengers,

at \$1,410 each; stenographer to Journal clerk, \$1,310; 9 telephone operators, at \$1,200 each; 3 session telephone operators, at \$100 per month each; substitute telephone operator, when required, at \$3.30 per day; laborers—3 at \$1,200 each, 9 at \$1,010 each.

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

Clerks, messengers, and janitors to the following committees: Accounts—clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$2,150; janitor, \$1,310. Agriculture—clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$2,150; janitor, \$1,310. Appropriations—clerk, \$5,000, and \$1,000 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; assistant clerk, \$4,000; six assistant clerks, at \$3,000 each; assistant clerk, \$2,440; janitor, \$1,440. Banking and Currency—clerk, \$2,360; assistant clerk, \$1,520; janitor, \$1,010. Census—clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,010. Claims—clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$1,520; janitor, \$1,010. Coinage, Weights, and Measures—clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,010. Disposition of Useless Executive Papers—clerk, \$2,360. District of Columbia—clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$2,150; janitor, \$1,010. Education—clerk, \$2,360. Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress—clerk, \$2,360. Elections No. 1—clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,010. Elections No. 2—clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,010. Elections No. 3—clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,010. Enrolled Bills—clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,010. Flood Control—clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,010. Foreign Affairs—clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$2,150; janitor, \$1,010. Immigration and Naturalization—clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,010. Indian Affairs—clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$2,150; janitor, \$1,010. Industrial Arts and Expositions—clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,010. Insular Affairs—clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,010. Interstate and Foreign Commerce—clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,830; janitor, \$1,310. Irrigation and Reclamation—clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,010. Invalid Pensions—clerk, \$2,880; stenographer, \$2,560; assistant clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,240. Judiciary—clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$1,940; janitor, \$1,240. Labor—clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,010. Library—clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,010. Merchant Marine and Fisheries—clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,010. Military Affairs—clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$1,830; janitor, \$1,310. Mines and Mining—clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,010. Naval Affairs—clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$1,830; janitor, \$1,310. Patents—clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,010. Pensions—clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$1,940; janitor, \$1,010. Post Offices and Post Roads—clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$1,730; janitor, \$1,310. Printing—clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,310. Public Buildings and Grounds—clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$1,520; janitor, \$1,010. Public Lands—clerk, \$2,360; assistant clerk, \$1,520; janitor, \$1,010. Civil Service—clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,010. Revision of the Laws—clerk, \$3,000; janitor, \$1,010. Rivers and Harbors—clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$2,150; janitor, \$1,310. Roads—clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,010. Rules—clerk, \$2,360; assistant clerk, \$1,830; janitor, \$1,010. Territories—clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,010. War Claims—clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$1,520; janitor, \$1,010. Ways and Means—clerk, \$3,000; assistant clerk and stenographer, \$2,360; assistant clerk, \$2,250; janitors—one \$1,310, one \$1,010. World War Veterans' Legislation—clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$2,150.

OFFICE OF SERGEANT AT ARMS

Sergeant at Arms, \$6,500; Deputy Sergeant at Arms, \$2,880; cashier, \$4,000; two bookkeepers, at \$2,640 each; Deputy Sergeant at Arms in charge of pairs, \$2,150; pair clerk and messenger, \$2,150; messenger, \$1,730; stenographer and typewriter, \$1,200; skilled laborer, \$1,140.

Police force, House Office Building, under the Sergeant at Arms: Lieutenant, \$1,520; 19 privates, at \$1,360 each.

OFFICE OF THE DOORKEEPER

Doorkeeper, \$5,000; special employee, \$2,040; superintendent of House press gallery, \$2,240; assistant to the superintendent of the House press gallery, \$1,520; janitor, \$2,040; messengers—17 at \$1,500 each, 14 on soldiers' roll at \$1,520 each; laborers—17 at \$1,010 each, 2 known as cloakroom men at \$1,140 each, 8 known as cloakroom men, 1 at \$1,010, and 7 at \$890 each; 2 female attendants in ladies' retiring rooms at \$1,440 each; superintendent of folding room, \$2,880; foreman of folding room, \$2,340; chief clerk to superintendent of folding room, \$2,150; 3 clerks at \$1,940 each; janitor, \$1,010; laborer, \$1,010; 31 folders, at \$1,200 each; shipping clerk, \$1,520; 2 drivers, at \$1,140 each; 2 chief pages at \$1,740 each; 2 telephone pages, at \$1,440 each; 2 floor managers of telephones (1 for the minority), at \$2,400 each; assistant messenger in charge of telephones, \$1,830; 42 pages during the session at \$3.30 per day each; laborer, \$1,100; superintendent of document room, \$3,050; assistant superintendent of document room, \$2,460; clerk, \$2,040; assistant clerk, \$1,940; 8 assistants, at \$1,600 each; janitor, \$1,220; messenger to pressroom, \$1,310.

SPECIAL AND MINORITY EMPLOYEES

Special employee (Joel Grayson) in the document room, \$2,740. Six minority employees, at \$2,150 each, authorized and named in the resolution of December 5, 1923.

Assistant foreman of the folding room, authorized in the resolution of September 30, 1913, at \$4.76 per day.

Laborer, authorized and named in the resolution of April 23, 1914, \$1.140.

Laborer, authorized and named in the resolution of December 10, 1901, \$1.140.

Clerk, under the direction of the Clerk of the House, named in the resolution of February 13, 1923, \$2,740.

Successors to any of the employees provided for in the five preceding paragraphs may be named by the House of Representatives at any time.

Office of Majority Floor Leader: Legislative clerk, \$3,600; clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$1,830; janitor, \$1,310.

Conference Minority: Clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$1,740; janitor, \$1,310. The foregoing employees to be appointed by the minority leader.

Two messengers, one in the majority caucus room, and one in the minority caucus room, to be appointed by the majority and minority whips, respectively, at \$1,520 each.

POST OFFICE

Postmaster, \$4,200; assistant postmaster, \$2,570; registry and money-order clerk, \$1,830; 34 messengers (including one to superintend transportation of mails), at \$1,520 each; substitute messengers and extra services of regular employees, when required, at the rate of not to exceed \$105 per month each; laborer, \$1,010.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATES

Six official reporters of the proceedings and debates of the House, at \$6,000 each; assistant, \$3,000; 6 expert transcribers, at \$1,520 each; janitor, \$1,220.

COMMITTEE STENOGRAPHERS

Four stenographers to committees, at \$6,000 each; janitor, \$1,220.

CLERK HIRE, MEMBERS, DELEGATES, AND RESIDENT COMMISSIONERS

The clerk hire for each Member, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner shall be at the rate of \$4,000 per annum and shall be paid in accordance with the act of January 25, 1923 (42 Stat., chap. 43, p. 1217): *Provided*, That no person shall receive a salary from such clerk hire at a rate in excess of \$3,300 per annum.

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect on July 1, 1924.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I demand a second, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as this is a matter in which every Member is interested, I make the point of no quorum. I withdraw it for the present, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, the bill before us is based upon the recommendations contained in the report of the joint committee for the readjustment of salaries of the officers and employees of Congress, submitted on December 3, 1923, and printed as House Document No. 131 of the present session.

The necessity for action at this time in connection with the employees of Congress is due to the fact that the classification act of 1923, which makes provision for the classification of employees in the executive departments, does not extend to the employees of Congress.

The following specific recommendations of the joint committee are the basis for the rates of compensation incorporated in the bill:

The annual compensation of clerks to Senate committees, the clerk to the conference minority, and chief clerks to Senators who are not chairmen of committees is fixed at \$3,300 each per annum, except the clerk of the Committee on Finance, which is recommended at \$3,600, and one assistant clerk of the Committee on Appropriations at \$3,300.

The allowance for clerk hire for each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner is fixed at not exceeding \$4,000 per annum, with the limitation that the maximum salary of any person should not exceed \$3,300.

That is to say, if there is only one clerk employed, \$3,300 will be the most that can be paid, whereas if two or more clerks are employed by any Member of the House they may receive an aggregate of \$4,000, to be divided in such proportions as the Member may suggest when he files the names of those who are to be employed by him with the Clerk of the House.

The salary of the clerk of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House is fixed at \$3,600 per annum.

All specific salaries of \$4,500 per annum or more remain at present rates.

All specific salaries less than \$4,500 per annum, not included in the foregoing recommendations, are increased 5 per cent per

annum on the total rate of basic salary plus additional compensation in cases where the additional compensation applies, and 5 per cent per annum on the basic rate where the additional compensation does not apply. In instances where substantial increases in basic pay have been granted comparatively recently the present basic salary, plus the additional compensation, is recommended without the 5 per cent increase.

Mr. FREE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. FREE. I notice that the name of Henry M. Rose is inserted, and it is the only name I see that is inserted in the bill. That is on page 2, line 4, and I would like to ask the gentleman why that is done.

Mr. MADDEN. That is under a special act.

In cases of employees paid from lump-sum appropriations it is recommended that the proper administrative officers submit estimates for the fiscal year 1925, in the manner prescribed by law, for such amounts as will be necessary to enable them to apply the \$240 bonus and the 5 per cent increase to employees carried on lump-sum rolls under the same restrictions as the committee has herein recommended for the specific employments.

In connection with the appropriation for clerk hire for Representatives, Delegates, and Commissioners, it should be remembered that the additional compensation (\$240 per annum) for the fiscal year 1924 is applicable in all cases where the salary fixed by the Member brings the employee within the proper range. The clerk-hire allowance of approximately 90 per cent of the House membership is now at the rate of \$3,680 per annum. This rate consists of a basic rate of \$3,200 (from which the Member employs two clerks at basic rates which do not exceed the total of \$3,200 for the two persons), plus the \$240 additional compensation which is added to the basic rate of each clerk. The average salary of the persons paid from the clerk-hire appropriation and the supplemental allotment from the additional compensation appropriation is approximately \$1,900. The average salary under the rate recommended in this report (\$4,000 where two clerks are employed and \$3,300 where only one is employed) would be approximately \$2,100.

On pages 5 to 14, inclusive, of the report of the joint committee will be found a detailed tabulation giving each specific employment covered by the bill, showing the present basic pay, the \$240 bonus, and the total present rate, compared with the rate recommended in the bill. The bill is identical with the terms of the report of the joint committee with a few exceptions. The number of pages for the Senate has been increased to 21 and that number is included in the bill in lieu of the 16 included in the report. The House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation was created subsequently to the making of the report and by resolution of the House has been granted a clerk and assistant clerk, both of which are incorporated in the bill. The position of Chief Clerk of the House, \$4,500, and the allowance of \$1,000 for stenographic services for that office, the assistant chief clerk at \$2,740, and the position of superintendent of furniture repair shop, \$3,000 (carried on a lump-sum roll), have been eliminated. In their places the bill includes a property custodian and superintendent of furniture and repair shop, who shall be a skilled cabinetmaker or upholsterer and experienced in the construction and purchase of furniture, at \$3,600, and two assistant custodians, at \$3,000 each. The net reduction in annual expense due to these changes is \$1,640.

On the basis of the recommendations contained in the joint committee's report and included in the accompanying bill, the following tabulation shows the approximate total number of persons, the present rate of \$240 bonus; the total present rate, and the recommended rate:

Recapitulation

Offices and designations of positions	Number	Basic rate	Additional compensation	Total rate	Suggested rate
Senate.....	660	\$1,097,387.50	\$151,230.00	\$1,248,617.50	\$1,351,960.00
House of Representatives.....	1,242	2,071,919.10	280,230.00	2,352,149.10	2,543,180.00
Capitol police.....	53	57,300.00	12,720.00	70,020.00	73,820.00
Joint Committee on Printing.....	3	7,750.00	480.00	8,230.00	8,230.00
Legislative drafting service.....	9	27,500.00	-----	27,500.00	28,375.00
Architect of the Capitol.....	394	379,446.97	86,263.10	465,710.07	489,275.00
Grand total.....	12,361	\$3,641,303.57	\$530,903.10	\$4,172,206.67	\$4,497,840.00

1 Exclusive of the number and pay of pages and session telephone operators.

The foregoing table shows an increase of the recommended salaries over the present salaries (including \$240 additional compensation) of \$325,633.33, to which must be added an indefinite sum sufficient to apply the 5 per cent to the compensation of the pages and session telephone operators. The present average salary is \$1,767. The recommended average salary is \$1,905—an increase of \$138.

The increased annual cost of \$325,633.33 does not include the increase on account of pages and other session employees or employees whose services are of a temporary character. The amounts to be added on this account will vary according to the length of the sessions of Congress, but should not make the aggregate increased cost in any year in excess of \$360,000.

The recommendations made in the bill are believed by the committee to be as uniform as possible, considering the class of service that is involved, and to be in proportion to the general results arrived at in the classification of the employees in the executive departments in the District of Columbia.

The estimates submitted to Congress to carry out the classification act in the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1925 result in the addition of \$3,200,000, or approximately 4 per cent, to the total pay roll of the personnel involved. The amount recommended to be added through the enactment of this bill represents an increase of approximately 8 per cent in the total present pay roll.

I wish to say, gentlemen, that in considering the problems involved in the adjustment of the compensation of officers and employees of the legislative branch of the Government, under the direction which you were pleased to give the joint committee, we considered what additional compensation was being paid under the classification act to those who are engaged in the administrative side of the Government, and we endeavored, in reaching our conclusions in connection with the legislative branch of the service, to come as near fixing the compensation of those employed under the legislative branch of the Government as we could to those fixed by the Classification Board in connection with the administrative employees.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. MADDEN. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Will the gentleman explain the very last clause of the bill? It seems to me entirely unreasonable.

Mr. MADDEN. The last clause of the bill provides that the clerk hire of a Member, where he employs two people, shall be \$4,000. If he only employs one person, it means he can not draw more than \$3,300. The reason for that is that in the Senate no Senator has a secretary as such, and the clerks to the committees of the Senate act not only as clerks to committees but also as secretaries to the Senators.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. How many employees do they have?

Mr. MADDEN. Let me make this explanation first and then I will answer the other question. It was provided that Senators who were not chairmen of committees should be allowed \$3,300. It is true that Senators have more than one clerk, but the chief clerk to the Senator is not only the clerk to the committee but also a clerk to the Senator, and in addition to the chief clerk each Senator has three additional clerks, if I recall correctly; and it is very proper that he should have because the work of a Senator covers a whole State, and he has very much more to do than a Member of the House, and could not under any circumstances do the work he is called upon to do unless he had these additional employees.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The 70 Senators who are not chairmen of committees each has a clerk at \$3,300, one at \$1,940, one at \$1,830, and one at \$1,520.

Mr. MADDEN. That is true.

Mr. BLANTON. And they are not chairmen of committees.

Mr. MADDEN. That is true. I said where the Senator was not a chairman of a committee he had the same rate as the Senator who is a chairman of a committee.

Mr. BLANTON. And, as a matter of fact, they do not have a bit more work to do than a Congressman.

Mr. MADDEN. Well, they say they have, and, of course, we can not deny that.

Mr. BLANTON. I can.

Mr. RUBEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes, indeed.

Mr. RUBEY. In talking about clerks to Senators is it not a fact there are clerks to Senators who come only half a day, some working in the morning until noon and others coming at half past 1 and working the rest of the day; and is it

not also a fact they have so many clerks over there that they fall over one another trying to get into the offices?

Mr. MADDEN. I can not answer that question; I do not know.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. But the particular question I was asking my friend was this: If there is provided \$4,000 for clerk hire for a Representative, why should not the Representative be allowed to expend the money as he thinks proper?

Mr. MADDEN. The law provides how the Representative shall make the appointments and how he shall file the names.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. That is true, but this is the difficulty. I take a case now that is probably illustrative of a great many cases. Suppose there is a Member who employs a high-class man and pays him all that is allowed at the present time, which, I believe, is \$3,200 a year. He may desire to pay \$4,000, but this provision would forbid him doing that.

Mr. MADDEN. It would.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Therefore, he can not get along without paying his clerk \$3,200, and then the six or seven hundred dollars additional will count for nothing. That is the situation to be created.

Mr. MADDEN. I am frank to say that this is done so that no Member employing a single individual will be able to pay more than a Senator pays a single individual.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. But a Senator now gets something like \$7,500 as a total allowance for clerk hire.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it is my purpose to use but a few moments of the time at my disposal. I want to make a very brief statement of my position upon this bill and then yield such time as I may have left to other gentlemen who wish to speak upon it.

In March, 1923, Congress provided for a joint committee to take into consideration the adjustment of salaries of House and Senate employees, including clerical forces of the Senators and of the Representatives. This committee was composed in the Senate of Senator WARREN, Senator SMOOT, and Senator OVERMAN and in the House of Congressman MADDEN, Congressman ANDERSON, and Congressman BYRNS of South Carolina. The committee has submitted a majority report, which is signed by the entire committee of the Senate and by two of the House members. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNS] filed a minority report. I am very sorry the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNS] is not here to-day. He told me the latter part of the week that he understood this bill was coming up under a suspension of the rules and that he was absolutely compelled to be away from the House to-day and to-morrow, but he wished his minority report called to the attention of the House, and I am going to read it to you. It is short and is as follows:

I am not in favor of either increasing or reducing the compensation of the employees of the legislative branch of the Government. I think these employees should receive the compensation they are now receiving, including the basic salary and the bonus.

JAMES F. BYRNS.

I concur with the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNS] in the position he has taken. So far as I know, there was never any particular desire—there may have been a desire, but there was never any expectation—on the part of the employees of the Senate and the House that they should receive anything more than their basic salary plus the bonus which they have been receiving during the last few years.

It is not proposed to reenact the bonus feature for the next fiscal year. Therefore this committee was appointed to take into consideration the question of adjustment of salaries and to make a report such as they have done; but there were many of us who, like the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNS], felt that while we were not in favor of reducing any of the employees of the Senate or of the House, on the other hand, we were not in favor of increasing their salaries above what they are now drawing as a basic salary plus the bonus.

The proposition that is submitted here means just this in expenditure: It means that the expenditures of the Government during the next fiscal year will be increased in the sum of \$325,633.33 per annum, plus 5 per cent, which is to be added to the salaries of telephone operators and pages, and which is not included in this report.

Mr. MADDEN. I am sorry my colleague makes that statement, because this \$325,000 includes the 5 per cent.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will read what the report says. I think I am accurate in the statement. The report says:

The foregoing table shows an increase of the recommended salaries over the present salaries (including \$240 additional compensation) of \$325,633.33, to which must be added an indefinite sum sufficient to apply the 5 per cent to the compensation of the pages and session telephone operators.

Mr. MADDEN. That is very small, however.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not doubt that, but that is the statement I made and I intended to be accurate. It is not a pleasant thing to oppose an increase of salaries for employees, particularly so when it applies to those close to you, in your office, with whom you come in contact every day, whose efficiency you are familiar with, but I can not support this bill and be consistent and true to my convictions and my belief as to what Congress should do in this day when the taxpayers are demanding relief, when the expenditures of the Government have increased to a point beyond that anybody ever dreamed of in times of peace, and when every effort is being made or ought to be made to reduce expenditures of the Government. I am unwilling, no matter who may be involved, by my vote to increase the burdens of the taxpayers of this Government.

For that reason I wish to repeat that I can not vote for this bill. As was said a while ago the Senators have four clerks now. Those Senators who are not chairmen of committees have under this bill a secretary at \$3,300, a clerk at \$1,940, another at \$1,830, and another at \$1,520. I do not know whether they need them or not. Some have told me, and on the best of authority, that many of the clerks in the Senate are not worked so hard as the clerks in the House Office Building. This bill makes too great a distinction in the allowance made for the Senate and that made for the House. Everyone knows that clerks to Representatives are worked much harder than the four clerks of Senators. Their own clerks will not deny that. If they would consent to eliminate one of their clerks, it would enable increase of the others without additional expenditure. But whether that be true or not, the Senate under this bill will be given over \$8,500 for clerk hire, and the House \$4,000. At the present time it is \$7,760 and \$3,680. I do not believe in view of the situation of the Treasury that Congress ought to put itself in the attitude of making this increase for its own force. I would not vote to increase my own salary, and I am not willing to vote to increase the salaries of the House and Senate employees under present circumstances.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. This bill would give the Senators \$8,500 for clerk hire, and what are they getting now?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. \$7,760.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. We have no demonstration that they are in any need of this increase on the Senate side?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. None at all, as far as I know.

Mr. SMITH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. SMITH. On page 6 of the bill is this language, lines 6, 7, and 8:

Such clerks and assistant clerks shall be ex-officio clerks and assistant clerks of any committee of which their Senator is chairman.

As I understand, that provision does not displace committee clerks but simply provides that these clerks of Senators shall also do committee work if they are needed in order to expedite the committee's business.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is my understanding.

Mr. SMITH. Why did not the gentleman insert a similar provision with reference to House clerks?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Because I was not on the committee. It was the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES]. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STENGLE. Will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will.

Mr. STENGLE. The gentleman is a member of the Appropriations Committee of the House, which committee has approved a large increase in the salary of bureau chiefs. Will the gentleman explain for my benefit by what process of reasoning he could favor that and not favor an increase of the poor pay of some of the employees of the House?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The Committee on Appropriations did not make any increases. They were made under the reclassification law, over which the committee had no control.

I have stated my personal views relative to this bill. If there was opportunity to amend some of its provisions, I might vote for it, but under the motion made we are called upon to vote for it, without opportunity for consideration and without opportunity to amend. It ought not to be passed under a motion to suspend the rules.

Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, it is a crime upon the country and upon this House to call a bill up like this under suspension of the rules. You can not argue it, you can not debate it except for the measly little 20 minutes to the side that is allowed for debate, and you can not debate a bill of this character in that time. You can not change an item in it. You have got to take it exactly as it is written without a change. I say such a bill as this under suspension of the rules is a crime against the membership of this House.

This bill (H. R. 8262) was introduced in this House by the gentlemen from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] on March 27, 1924, and was then referred to the Special Committee on Adjustment of Legislative Salaries, and by such committee was favorably reported to this House only on last Thursday, April 3, 1924. And, so far as I know, there was not a single Democrat on this side of the aisle who knew until just a few minutes ago that this bill would be called up to-day. And I do not believe that there were 15 Republicans who knew it. The majority leader should have given us some notice of it. He made no mention of it in his legislative program.

For the benefit of some of the new Members here who probably may not be familiar with the rules, that by calling this bill up now under suspension, as it has been called up, the debate is limited to 20 minutes to the side, controlled by two men; not a single Member has the right to offer any amendment whatever; we are compelled to vote for every item in it, just as it has been written, or to vote against the whole bill. Not even a motion to recommit is permissible. We have to swallow it like a bunch of helpless, open-mouthed mocking birds. I am not going to do it. I am surprised that our good friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] should be a party to it.

Mr. MADDEN. I am entirely responsible for it, and I assume that responsibility.

Mr. BLANTON. Such a very important bill as this ought to be brought regularly before the House under the rules and not under suspension, so that we could debate it, so that the membership could be heard, and the sentiment of the House pass upon it and amend it in many particulars that are outrageous as they now stand in the bill. Not half of the membership of the House is present. We have just a few minutes of debate, and it will be over in a very short time. Then the bells will ring and the membership will come over here, if we are able to force a roll call, and they will ask what is up and will be told at the door that it is the committee's bill; that it is a bill from the Committee on Appropriations, and 9 out of 10 of our colleagues will vote for it without knowing what is in it. I say, that is not right and just to the membership of this House.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. In just a moment.

Mr. MADDEN. Just for a question.

Mr. BLANTON. I regret that I can not yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, as I desire to use the little time I have. The chairman of our great Committee on Appropriations may answer me in his own time. Of all the salary-raising bills that this Congress has been passing continually since we met, this one takes the prize. It is entitled to the blue ribbon. It stands in a class to itself. It exemplifies the innate modesty concerning money spending of our economical brothers in the far end of the Capitol.

I deny that Senators work harder than Congressmen. I deny that more work is done in the offices of Senators than in the offices of Congressmen. I deny that either of the Senators from Texas do any more work than I do each day of the year. I deny that the office of either of the distinguished Senators from Texas does more work than my office does each day in the year. No secretary of any Senator in Washington does more work than my secretary. You may say that they represent a whole State. That is true, but only a comparatively few people from each district in the State write to them, while every person in our respective districts having business here writes to us, and our work in connection with all pending legislation is just as arduous as that of any Senator. Yet each Senator who is not a chairman of a committee is allowed one clerk at \$3,300, another clerk at \$1,940, another clerk at \$1,830, and another clerk at \$1,520, aggregating \$8,500 for clerk hire, while we are given only \$4,000 for clerk hire. And \$4,000 is every cent that Senators need, for their work is practically the same as ours. And I will not vote to give them \$8,500 for clerk hire, and I want a chance to properly amend this bill when it passes, and not have to vote for every item in it just as it has been written. Let me put in parallel columns the salaries paid to certain of the Senate employees as compared with the salaries paid to certain of the House employees, and let you contrast them, to wit:

SENATE

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Secretary of the Senate, including compensation as disbursing officer of salaries of Senators, and of contingent fund of the Senate, \$6,500; assistant secretary, Henry M. Rose, \$5,500; reading clerk, \$4,500; financial clerk, \$4,500; chief clerk, \$3,420; assistant financial clerk, \$3,600; minute and Journal clerk, \$3,600; principal clerk, \$3,150; librarian, \$3,000; enrolling clerk, \$3,150; printing clerk, \$3,000; executive clerk, \$2,890; file clerk, chief bookkeeper, and assistant Journal clerk, at \$2,880 each; first assistant librarian, and keeper of stationery, \$2,780 each; assistant librarian, \$2,150; skilled laborer, \$1,520; clerks—three at \$2,880 each, two at \$2,590 each, one \$2,400, one \$2,100, one \$1,770; assistant keeper of stationery, \$2,300; assistant in stationery room, \$1,520; messenger in library, \$1,310; special officer, \$2,150; assistant messenger, \$1,520; laborers—three at \$1,140 each; three at \$1,010 each, one in stationery room, \$1,440.

Now, in parallel columns let us compare the salaries paid to other Senate employees with those paid to House employees, and again contrast the difference:

SENATE

OFFICE OF SERGEANT AT ARMS AND DOORKEEPER

Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, \$6,500; Assistant Doorkeeper, \$4,200; Acting Assistant Doorkeeper, \$4,200; 2 floor assistants, at \$3,600 each; messengers—5 (acting as assistant doorkeepers, including 1 for minority), at \$2,150 each; 38 (including 1 for minority), at \$1,770 each; 1, \$1,310; 1 at card door, \$1,940; clerk on Journal work for CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to be selected by the official reporters, \$2,800; storekeeper, \$2,740; stenographer in charge of furniture accounts and records, \$1,520; upholsterer and locksmith, \$1,770; cabinetmaker, \$1,520; 3 carpenters, at \$1,390 each; janitor, \$1,520; 5 skilled laborers, at \$1,310 each; laborer in charge of private passage, \$1,340; 2 female attendants in charge of ladies' retiring rooms, at \$1,240 each; 3 attendants to women's toilet rooms, Senate Office Building, at \$1,010 each; telephone operators—chief \$2,040, 4 at \$1,200 each; night operator, \$1,010; telephone page, \$1,010; laborer in charge of Senate toilet rooms in

HOUSE

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

Clerk of the House of Representatives, including compensation as disbursing officer of the contingent fund, \$6,500; Journal clerk, and two reading clerks, at \$4,200 each; disbursing clerk, \$3,570; tally clerk, \$3,470; file clerk, \$3,420; enrolling clerk, \$3,200 and \$1,000 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; property custodian and superintendent of furniture and repair shop, who shall be a skilled cabinetmaker or upholsterer and experienced in the construction and purchase of furniture, \$3,000; two assistant custodians at \$3,000 each; chief bill clerk, \$3,150; assistant enrolling clerk, \$2,880; assistant to disbursing clerk, \$2,780; stationery clerk, \$2,570; librarian, \$2,460; assistant librarian, \$2,240; assistant file clerk, \$2,250; assistant librarian, and assistant Journal clerk, at \$2,150 each; clerks—one \$2,150, three at \$2,020 each; bookkeeper, and assistant in disbursing office, at \$1,940 each; four assistants to chief bill clerk, at \$1,830 each; stenographer to the Clerk, \$1,730; locksmith and typewriter repairer, \$1,620; messenger and clock repairer, \$1,520; assistant in stationery room, \$1,520; three messengers, at \$1,410 each; stenographer to Journal clerk, \$1,310; nine telephone operators, at \$1,200 each; three session telephone operators, at \$100 per month each; substitute telephone operator, when required, at \$3.30 per day; laborers—three at \$1,200 each; nine at \$1,010 each.

HOUSE

OFFICE OF SERGEANT AT ARMS

Sergeant at Arms, \$6,500; Deputy Sergeant at Arms, \$2,880; cashier, \$4,000; 2 bookkeepers, at \$2,640 each; Deputy Sergeant at Arms in charge of pairs, \$2,150; pair clerk and messenger, \$2,150; messenger, \$1,730; stenographer and typewriter, \$1,200; skilled laborer, \$1,140.

OFFICE OF THE DOORKEEPER

Doorkeeper, \$5,000; special employee, \$2,040; superintendent of House press gallery, \$2,240; assistant to the superintendent of the House press gallery, \$1,520; janitor, \$2,040; messengers—17 at \$1,500 each, 14 on soldiers' roll at \$1,520 each; laborers—17 at \$1,010 each, 2 known as cloakroom men at \$1,140 each, 8 known as cloakroom men, 1 at \$1,010, and 7 at \$890 each; 2 female attendants in ladies' retiring rooms at \$1,440 each; superintendent of folding room, \$2,880; foreman of folding room, \$2,340; chief clerk to superintendent of folding room, \$2,150; 3 clerks at \$1,940 each; janitor, \$1,010; laborer, \$1,010; 31 folders, at \$1,200 each; shipping clerk,

old library space, \$950; press gallery—superintendent, \$2,740; assistant superintendent, \$1,840; messenger for service to press correspondents, \$1,240; laborers—3, at \$1,100 each; 34, at \$1,010 each; 21 pages for the Senate Chamber, at the rate of \$3.30 per day each, during the session.

\$1,520; 2 drivers, at \$1,140 each; 2 chief pages, at \$1,740 each; 2 telephone pages, at \$1,440 each; 2 floor managers of telephones (1 for the minority), at \$2,400 each; assistant messenger in charge of telephones, \$1,830; 42 pages during the session, at \$3.30 per day each; laborer, \$1,100; superintendent of document room, \$3,050; assistant superintendent of document room, \$2,460; clerk, \$2,040; assistant clerk, \$1,940; 8 assistants at \$1,600 each; janitor, \$1,220; messenger to pressroom, \$1,310.

Illustrating the employees provided for committees, let me call attention to the fact that for the Senate Committee on Appropriations there is one clerk at \$6,000, two assistant clerks at \$3,300 each, three assistant clerks at \$2,700 each, and two assistant clerks at \$2,100 each, and a messenger at \$1,440. For the House Committee on Appropriations there is one clerk at \$5,000, with the provision that the present incumbent shall draw \$1,000 extra, an assistant clerk at \$4,000, six assistant clerks at \$3,000 each, an assistant clerk at \$2,440, and a janitor at \$1,440; and it will be remembered that all appropriation bills originate in the House and are prepared and framed by the employees of the House Appropriations Committee.

For the Senate Committee on Claims this bill allows one clerk at \$3,300, one assistant clerk at \$2,570, one assistant clerk at \$2,360, and two assistant clerks at \$1,830 each, while for the House Committee on Claims this bill allows one clerk at \$2,880, an assistant clerk at \$1,520, and a janitor at \$1,010. The foregoing fairly illustrates the employees on the various and sundry big and little committees of the House and Senate. And these are all patronage jobs, and when the Congress adjourns for nine months, like it did from March 4 to December, 1923, all of these employees are drawing salaries with nothing to do, and there are entirely too many of them, and their salaries are far beyond the clerical fees paid by the industrial world. I can not vote for this bill when it can not be amended. What we ought to do is to defeat it under suspension and then properly debate and amend it under the rules of the House.

On January 27, 1924, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DARROW], who is a member of the Republican steering committee of this House, arose and said that he "had been requested to present to the House of Representatives a petition signed by 345,516 actual and real farmers in this country." Let me show you what then occurred:

Mr. DARROW. These names have been voluntarily obtained after a thorough explanation of the purposes. The petition itself simply asks for a reduction in the expenditures of the Government—a cut in Government costs for the purpose, of course, of reducing taxes and the heavy burden that is placed upon all classes of people by war taxes. Some one has asked me where these names come from. They came chiefly from the great Middle West. Speaking in round numbers, from Indiana there are 30,000 names, from Iowa 29,000, from Kansas 22,000, from Kentucky 14,000, from Michigan 17,000, from Minnesota 20,000, from Missouri 11,000, from Nebraska 16,000, from Ohio 68,000, from Pennsylvania 23,000. Sometimes my friends here forget that Pennsylvania is one of the great agricultural States of this Union. All of the other States of the Union are represented with one exception, and that is Nevada. The total of the other States is 61,528.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DARROW. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman is a distinguished member of the steering committee of the dominant party of this House. I take it that this box car of petitions is a protest against present conditions?

Mr. DARROW. It is asking for a cut in governmental expenditures.

Mr. BLANTON. And is a protest against present conditions. The farmers want the present conditions changed; they want taxes reduced; they want extravagance of government stopped, and they have grounds for all of that.

Mr. DARROW. This petition was started before—

Mr. BLANTON. I take it that it is an indictment against the present management of the Government's business.

And upon insistence by the gentleman from Maryland, the gentleman from Pennsylvania finally read the petition:

Mr. LINTHICUM. The gentleman omitted to read the petition. Will he kindly do so?

Mr. DARROW. I will be very much pleased to read it, although the gentleman will not expect me to read all of the names.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska, I would like to have the names of those from Nebraska,

Mr. DARROW. The petition reads as follows:

"We the undersigned, who are directly interested in farming and the welfare of the people, do hereby respectfully petition or request Congress through the Farm Journal to pass legislation which will cut the cost of running the Government by reducing all nonessential expenses, eliminating all unnecessary employees, and voting against all increases in salaries."

In the remainder of my time, Mr. Speaker, I ask to have read from the desk, if I may, a letter from Mr. Jenkins, which will probably more clearly express the purpose of this petition than anything that I could say.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object to the reading of the letter, though I shall not object, I will ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania whether the steering committee is going to carry out the requests made by these farmers in this petition. I am going to help them do it as one Member of Congress, and I will say that I hope that the steering committee is going to do that.

And although I have almost daily called attention to it, that petition from 345,516 actual and real farmers of this country has been buried in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and has been daily ignored here ever since, for this administration has continued to raise salaries in practically every bill that has been passed so far.

The clerk to an ordinary committee of the Senate gets \$3,300 a year. The clerk of a House committee gets only \$2,880. Why should a clerk of the Senate committee who does the same character of work that a House clerk does get that much more salary per year? It is not right. His principal does not get any more salary. Should the subordinate clerk in the office get more?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. How can we expect the country to have any respect for the House if every time we have a chance as a body to take legislative action we permit this sort of discrimination against ourselves?

Mr. BLANTON. Why certainly! But who is permitting it? It is our Appropriations Committee who are bringing the bill like this in here before the House under suspension and not permitting the membership to open their mouths against it. We have only 20 minutes of debate, and we can not properly discuss it, and we can not change it if we wanted to in any particular. If 90 per cent of this House wanted to change this bill they could not do it. We have to take it just as the committee has framed it and vote for it from the first syllable to the last. That is the reason I said it is a crime upon the membership of this House. Oh, you new Members who call yourselves progressives, when you first came here you said you were not going to stand for this sort of thing and yet you are.

Mr. KVALE. We are not.

Mr. BLANTON. Then why don't you get up and denounce it?

Mr. KVALE. Because we haven't the time, and we can not get the time.

Mr. BLANTON. I just wanted you to think about it.

Mr. KVALE. We are thinking.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I presume that I am somewhat of a progressive new Member—

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, I admit that.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield me some of his time?

Mr. BLANTON. I would yield the gentleman the balance of my time if I could, but the rules do not permit it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY].

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Speaker, when I came into the House this morning this proposition was being taken up for consideration, and that was the first notice that we had that legislation of this character was sought to be enacted. I am opposed to this bill; this is no time to increase the salaries of our own clerks and the employees of this House. This bill is to be passed without opportunity of amendment. We have only to vote it up or vote it down, and so far as I am concerned, I am going to vote it down. I agree with what the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NEWTON] has said. We are discriminating against ourselves and in favor of another body. If we pass this bill we are going to give to each Senator for the increased pay of his clerks twice or three times as much as we give to each Member of the House. The Senators have so many clerks now that if you go into a Senator's office you will find it full of clerks. We do just as much work in our offices, many of us, as the individual Senators do. There is no question about

that. They have each four or five clerks and we have one or two. If we pass this bill we shall be giving them over \$800 each for additional clerk hire and giving to each member of the House for that purpose only \$320. The responsibility is upon us if we vote through this sort of legislation. So far as I am concerned I am opposed to it. I am in favor of voting it down and letting it come up in the House at some other time when we will have an opportunity to amend it. I realize that this is an unpopular position to take because many of the Members are interested in this legislation.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUBEY. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Does not the gentleman think that this is a very good illustration of the need of having some rule under which Members could be informed in advance of the business that is to be brought up in the House from day to day?

Mr. RUBEY. There is no question about that. As I said in the beginning, when we came here we did not know that this bill was to be before the House. This is unanimous-consent day and we had a right to believe that that calendar would be taken up in regular order.

Mr. BOYCE. Will the gentleman yield for a short statement?

Mr. RUBEY. I will gladly reserve the balance of my time and it can be yielded to the gentleman.

Mr. BOYCE. I desire to make the statement in the gentleman's time. I want to enter my solemn protest against action on this bill, of such public importance, in the manner that has been provided. There are features in the bill which I would vote for, but I am utterly opposed to being compelled to vote for it in blanket without an opportunity for amendment. I shall vote against the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill as written. [Applause.]

Mr. RUBEY. I thank the gentleman for his statement.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say, in reply to the gentlemen who have criticized the comparative allowance of the Senate and House, that under existing conditions the Senate has 47.4 per cent of the allowance paid for clerk hire to Senators and Members.

Mr. RUBEY. How many clerks are there?

Mr. MADDEN. I do not yield. Under the recommendation made in this bill the Senate will have only 45.4. The relationship between the Senate's expenses for clerk hire and the House for clerk hire is better under this bill than it has ever been before. It does not matter to me whether anybody votes for this or not. You charged us with the responsibility of adjusting the compensation. We are recommending an adjustment of the compensation. Now, the gentleman from Missouri who just took his seat says nobody knows what is in this bill. That is not our fault. This bill and report, giving every detail of what is in it, has been on file here since last December, and if nobody read what was reported the committee is not to blame for it.

Mr. RUBEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will yield.

Mr. RUBEY. We are not supposed to read all bills and reports—

Mr. MADDEN. But the gentleman tried to convey the idea we were bringing in something here surreptitiously. We are not. You have had every detail of this before you since December; and if we are ready to go on now and nobody wants to vote for it, it does not make a particle of difference to me. I do not care how you vote. I am presenting legislation proposed under your orders, and you can vote as you like.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. The proposition that the gentleman brings forth here, it is true, has been before the House and there has been opportunity for Members to inform themselves upon it. It gives the Members of the House something like \$320 more than what we have to-day for clerk hire, and to that extent the gentleman's course is commended, but—

Mr. MADDEN. I do not yield for a speech. I do not yield any further. What I want understood is that we are reporting here an adjusted compensation measure under the orders of the House; and if you do not like it, vote it down.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired; all time has expired. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Mr. RUBEY. I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays on this question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas demands the yeas and nays. Thirty gentlemen have arisen. The Chair will count the House. [After counting.] One hundred and seventy-three Members; not a sufficient number.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. It is clear there is no quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will bring in absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 207, nays 106, answered "present" 1, not voting 118, as follows:

YEAS—207

Abernethy	Freeman	McDuffie	Sears, Nebr.
Ackerman	French	McKenzie	Seger
Aldrich	Frothingham	McKeown	Shreve
Andrew	Fuller	McLeod	Simmons
Anthony	Gallivan	McSweeney	Sinnett
Ayres	MacGregor	Madden	Sites
Bacon	Gifford	Magee, N. Y.	Smith
Barbour	Glatfelter	Major, Mo.	Smithwick
Beck	Green, Iowa	Manlove	Snell
Beedy	Greene, Mass.	Martin	Snyder
Begg	Grist	Mead	Speaks
Bixler	Hadley	Merritt	Stedman
Boies	Hardy	Michener	Stengle
Bowling	Hastings	Miller, Wash.	Stephens
Browne, Wis.	Haugen	Mills	Stevenson
Brumm	Hawley	Minahan	Strong, Kans.
Buckley	Hayden	Mooney	Strong, Pa.
Bulwinkle	Hersey	Moore, Ohio	Summers, Wash.
Burton	Hickey	Morris	Swing
Butler	Hill, Md.	Murphy	Swoope
Cable	Howard, Okla.	Nelson, Me.	Tague
Campbell	Hull, Iowa	Nelson, Wis.	Taylor, Tenn.
Carter	Hull, William E.	Newton, Minn.	Temple
Casey	Humphreys	Newton, Mo.	Thompson
Chindblom	Jacobstein	Nolan	Timberlake
Clague	James	O'Connell, R. I.	Tincher
Clarke, N. Y.	Jeffers	O'Connor, La.	Tinkham
Cole, Iowa	Johnson, S. Dak.	O'Sullivan	Treadway
Cole, Ohio	Johnson, Wash.	Oliver, N. Y.	Tydings
Colton	Kearns	Peavey	Underhill
Connery	Keller	Perkins	Upshaw
Cooper, Ohio	Kelly	Porter	Valle
Cummings	Kendall	Prall	Vestal
Dallinger	Kerr	Ragon	Vincent, Mich.
Darrow	Ketcham	Raker	Vinson, Ky.
Davis, Minn.	King	Reece	Voigt
Deal	Kopp	Reid, Ill.	Wainwright
Dickinson, Iowa	LaGuardia	Richards	Ward, N. Y.
Dowell	Lampert	Roach	Watson
Dyer	Lankford	Robinson, Iowa	Weaver
Elliott	Lazaro	Robson, Ky.	White, Kans.
Evans, Mont.	Lea, Calif.	Rogers, Mass.	White, Me.
Fairchild	Leatherwood	Rogers, N. H.	Williams, Mich.
Faust	Leavitt	Rosenbloom	Williamson
Favrot	Leibach	Rouse	Winter
Fenn	Lineberger	Sabath	Wolff
Fish	Linthicum	Sanders, N. Y.	Wood
Fisher	Little	Schaffer	Woodruff
Fitzgerald	Logan	Schall	Wright
Fleetwood	Longworth	Schneider	Yates
Fredericks	Luce	Scott	Zihlman
Free	Lyon		

NAYS—106.

Allen	Crosser	Kunz	Rayburn
Allgood	Davis, Tenn.	Kvale	Reed, Ark.
Almon	Dickinson, Mo.	Lanham	Romjue
Arnold	Doughton	Larsen, Ga.	Ruby
Aswell	Drewry	Lilly	Sanders, Tex.
Bankhead	Driver	Lowrey	Sandlin
Barkley	Evans, Iowa	Lozier	Shallenberger
Bell	Fulbright	McLaughlin, Mich.	Stalker
Black, Tex.	Fulmer	McReynolds	Steagall
Bland	Garber	McSwain	Summers, Tex.
Blanton	Gardner, Ind.	Major, Ill.	Swank
Box	Garner, Tex.	Mansfield	Taylor, W. Va.
Boyce	Garrett, Tenn.	Mapes	Thatcher
Brand, Ohio	Garrett, Tex.	Milligan	Thomas, Okla.
Briggs	Gilbert	Montague	Tillman
Browne, N. J.	Greenwood	Moore, Ga.	Tucker
Browning	Hammer	Moore, Va.	Underwood
Buchanan	Hill, Ala.	Morehead	Vinson, Ga.
Burness	Hill, Wash.	Morrow	Ward, N. C.
Busby	Howard, Nebr.	Oldfield	Watkins
Byrnes, Tenn.	Huddleston	Oliver, Ala.	Wefald
Cannon	Hudspeth	Park, Ga.	Williams, Tex.
Collins	Johnson, Ky.	Peery	Wilson, Miss.
Connally, Tex.	Johnson, Tex.	Quin	Wilson, Ind.
Cook	Johnson, W. Va.	Ralney	Wingo
Cooper, Wis.	Jones	Ramsayer	
Crisp	Kincheloe	Rankin	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Pou

NOT VOTING—118.

Anderson	Celler	Davey	Geran
Bacharach	Christopherson	Dempsey	Gibson
Beers	Clancy	Denison	Goldsborough
Berger	Clark, Fla.	Dickstein	Graham, Ill.
Black, N. Y.	Cleary	Dominick	Graham, Pa.
Bloom	Collier	Doyle	Griffin
Boylan	Connolly, Pa.	Drane	Harrison
Brand, Ga.	Cornig	Eagan	Hawes
Britten	Cramton	Edmonds	Hoch
Burdick	Croll	Fairfield	Holaday
Byrnes, S. C.	Crowther	Foster	Hooker
Canfield	Cullen	Frear	Hudson
Carew	Curry	Funk	Hull, Morton D.

Hull, Tenn.	Magee, Pa.	Purnell	Thomas, Ky.
Jost	Michaelson	Quayle	Tilson
Kahn	Miller, Ill.	Ransley	Vare
Kent	Moore, Ill.	Rathbone	Wason
Kless	Moore, Ind.	Reed, N. Y.	Watres
Kindred	Morgan	Reed, W. Va.	Weller
Knutson	Morin	Salmon	Welsh
Kurtz	Mudd	Sanders, Ind.	Wertz
Langley	O'Brien	Sears, Fla.	Williams, Ill.
Larson, Minn.	O'Connell, N. Y.	Sherwood	Wilson, La.
Lee, Ga.	O'Connor, N. Y.	Sinclair	Winslow
Lindsay	Palge	Sproul, Ill.	Woodrum
McClintic	Parker	Sproul, Kans.	Wurzbach
McFadden	Parks, Ark.	Sullivan	Wyant
McLaughlin, Nebr.	Patterson	Sweet	Young
McNulty	Perlman	Taber	
MacLafferty	Phillips	Taylor, Colo.	

So, two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof, the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Mudd and Mr. Young' (for) with Mr. Thomas of Kentucky (against).

General pairs:

Mr. Patterson with Mr. Drane.
 Mr. Graham of Illinois with Mr. Jost.
 Mr. Langley with Mr. Clark of Florida.
 Mr. Rathbone with Mr. McClintic.
 Mr. Denison with Mr. Kindred.
 Mr. Cramton with Mr. Sullivan.
 Mr. Britten with Mr. Lindsay.
 Mr. Bacharach with Mr. Woodrum.
 Mr. Williams of Illinois with Mr. Hawes.
 Mr. Winslow with Mr. Canfield.
 Mr. Vare with Mr. Weller.
 Mr. Sweet with Mr. O'Connor of New York.
 Mr. McFadden with Mr. Boylan.
 Mr. Frear with Mr. Wilson of Louisiana.
 Mr. Connolly of Pennsylvania with Mr. O'Brien.
 Mr. Beers with Mr. Goldsborough.
 Mr. Purnell with Mr. Croll.
 Mr. Sinclair with Mr. Quayle.
 Mr. Ransley with Mr. Celler.
 Mr. Welsh with Mr. Hooker.
 Mr. Morin with Mr. Black of New York.
 Mr. Kurtz with Mr. Geran.
 Mr. Christopherson with Mr. Pou.
 Mr. Edmonds with Mr. Corning.
 Mr. Tilson with Mr. Sherwood.
 Mr. Michaelson with Mr. Dominick.
 Mr. Crowther with Mr. O'Connell of New York.
 Mr. Sproul of Kansas with Mr. Harrison.
 Mr. Watres with Mr. Bloom.
 Mr. Reed of New York with Mr. Collier.
 Mr. Kiess with Mr. Carew.
 Mr. Wyant with Mr. Parks of Arkansas.
 Mr. Foster with Mr. McNulty.
 Mr. Wertz with Mr. Kent.
 Mr. Dempsey with Mr. Griffin.
 Mr. Graham of Pennsylvania with Mr. Salmon.
 Mr. Holaday with Mr. Doyle.
 Mr. Kahn with Mr. Davey.
 Mr. Paige with Mr. Cullen.
 Mr. Miller of Illinois with Mr. Sears of Florida.
 Mr. MacLafferty with Mr. Eagan.
 Mr. Wason with Mr. Taylor of Colorado.
 Mr. Burdick with Mr. Clancy.
 Mr. Funk with Mr. Brand of Georgia.
 Mr. Sanders of Indiana with Mr. Cleary.
 Mr. Reed of West Virginia with Mr. Byrnes of South Carolina.
 Mr. Perlman with Mr. Dickstein.
 Mr. Parker with Mr. Berger.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is present, the Doorkeeper will reopen the doors. The Clerk will call the next bill on the Consent Calendar.

DIVISION OF LANDS AND FUNDS, OSAGE INDIANS IN OKLAHOMA, ETC.

The next bill on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 5726) to amend the act of Congress of March 3, 1921, entitled "An act to amend section 3 of the act of Congress of June 28, 1906, entitled 'An act of Congress for the division of the lands and funds of the Osage Indians in Oklahoma, and for other purposes.'"

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma and Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill as amended.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior shall cause to be paid at the end of each fiscal quarter to each adult member of the Osage Tribe of Indians in Oklahoma having a certificate of competency his or her pro rata share, either as a member of the tribe or heir of a deceased member, of the interest on trust funds, the bonus received from the sale of oil or gas leases, the royalties therefrom, and any other moneys due such Indian received during each fiscal quarter, including all moneys received prior to the passage of this act and

remaining unpaid; and so long as the accumulated income is sufficient the Secretary of the Interior shall cause to be paid to the adult members of said tribe not having a certificate of competency \$1,000 quarterly, except where such adult members have legal guardians, in which case the amounts provided for herein may be paid to the legal guardian or direct to such Indian in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior; the total amounts of such payments, however, shall not exceed \$1,000 quarterly, except as hereinafter provided; and shall cause to be paid for the maintenance and education, to either one of the parents or legal guardians actually having personally in charge, enrolled or unenrolled, minor member under 21 years of age, \$1,000 quarterly out of the income of each of said minors, and so long as the accumulated income of the parent or parents of a minor who has no income or whose income is less than \$500 per quarter is sufficient, shall cause to be paid to either of said parents having the care and custody of such minor \$500 quarterly, or such proportion thereof as the income of such minor may be less than \$500, in addition to the allowances above provided for such parents. Rentals due such adult members from their lands and their minor children's lands and all income from such adults' investments not exceeding \$500 a quarter shall be paid to them in addition to the allowance above provided. All payments to legal guardians of Osage Indians shall be expended subject to the joint approval in writing of the court and the superintendent of the Osage Agency. All payments to adults not having certificates of competency, including amounts paid for each minor, shall be subject to the supervision of the superintendent of the Osage Agency. The Secretary of the Interior shall invest or deposit the remainder, after paying all of the taxes of those members whose funds are subject to his supervision, as provided by existing law: *Provided*, That any part of such remainder, including minor's funds, not to exceed \$10,000 may be expended for the benefit of such member of the tribe for the specific purpose of purchasing or improving a home, and any additional amount may be expended in the prevention of or cure of any member or minor afflicted with tuberculosis or by any lingering or dangerous disease, when authorized by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and expended under his direction and supervision: *Provided further*, That at the beginning of each fiscal year there shall first be reserved and set aside, out of Osage tribal funds available for that purpose, a sufficient amount of money for the expenditures authorized by Congress out of Osage funds for that fiscal year. No guardian shall be appointed except on the written application of the Secretary of the Interior for the estate of a member of the Osage Tribe of Indians who does not have a certificate of competency or who is of one-half or more Indian blood. All funds and other property heretofore or hereafter received by a guardian of a member of the Osage Tribe of Indians, which was theretofore under the supervision and control of the Secretary of the Interior or the title to which was held in trust for such Indian by the United States, shall not thereby become divested of the supervision and control of the Secretary of the Interior or the United States be relieved of its trust; and such guardian shall not sell, dispose of, or otherwise encumber such fund or property without the approval of the Secretary of the Interior and in accordance with orders of the county court of Osage County, Okla. In case of the death, resignation, or removal from office of such a guardian the funds and property in his possession subject to supervision and control of the Secretary of the Interior or to which the United States held the title in trust shall be immediately delivered to the superintendent of the Osage Agency to be held by him and supervised or invested as hereinbefore provided.

SEC. 2. All funds of Osage Indians accruing to their credit and which are subject to supervision as above provided may, when deemed to be for the best interest of such Indians, be paid to the administrators of the estates of deceased Osage Indians or direct to their heirs, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, under regulations to be promulgated by him.

SEC. 3. Lands devised to members of the Osage Tribe of one-half or more Indian blood or who do not have certificates of competency under wills approved by the Secretary of the Interior, and lands inherited by such Indians, shall be inalienable unless such lands be conveyed with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior. Property of Osage Indians not having certificates of competency purchased as hereinbefore set forth shall not be subject to the lien of any debt, claim, or judgment except taxes, or be subject to alienation, without the approval of the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 4. Whenever the Secretary of the Interior shall find that any member of the Osage Tribe of more than one-half Indian blood to whom has been granted a certificate of competency is squandering or misusing his or her funds, he may revoke such certificate of competency after notice and hearing in accordance with such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, and thereafter the income of such member shall be subject to supervision and investment as herein provided for members not having certificates of competency to the same extent as if a certificate of competency had never been granted.

SEC. 5. No person convicted of having taken or who causes or procures another to take, the life of an Osage Indian shall inherit from or receive any interest in the estate of the decedent, regardless of where the crime was committed and the conviction obtained.

SEC. 6. No contract for debt hereafter made with a member of the Osage Tribe of Indians not having a certificate of competency shall have any validity unless approved by the Secretary of the Interior. In addition to the funds heretofore authorized, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to pay, out of the funds of a member of the Osage Tribe not having a certificate of competency, any indebtedness heretofore or hereafter incurred by such member by reason of his unlawful acts of carelessness or negligence.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. I demand a second.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I give myself five minutes.

Gentlemen of the House, after about six weeks of intensive investigation, both in hearings on the bill and in executive session, we bring here to-day by unanimous consent of the committee a bill with more than a majority present, and concurred in by all the committee, with the exception of one who voted against reporting the same.

This bill is a modification of an act passed March 3, 1921, which modified the law then in existence to the extent of prescribing the amounts of money which should be paid to this tribe of Osage Indians and imposing certain other restrictions with reference to guardians. The bill has worked splendidly, except with one or two exceptions. We attempted to provide in the bill of 1921 that the same amount of money which we allowed quarterly to the Indians should be paid to the guardian of the incompetent Indian who desired a guardian; but the courts of Oklahoma have interpreted the law so that now, when an Indian desires to have a guardian, the courts have held that his entire estate, including his entire income quarterly, shall be paid to him. The result is that while in 1921 we started out with about 700 incompetent Indians under the jurisdiction of the bureau, we now find that over 400 of them have released themselves from the jurisdiction of that bureau and have become wards of individual guardians. The result of that has been that those who stayed within the bureau have accumulated, by reason of the law setting aside about \$1,000 each quarterly, over \$17,000,000.

As to the 400 who left the jurisdiction of the bureau and took on individual guardians, by reason of the way in which their affairs have been handled, it is impossible for this committee to feel otherwise than that their estates have been badly managed. So we propose to limit the amount of money that the restricted Indian shall receive quarterly.

We propose to restrict the bill with reference to guardians so that in the future an incompetent Indian who has a guardian will receive only the same amount quarterly as the incompetent Indian who stays within the jurisdiction of the bureau. We keep in this bill a supervision of the impounding of their resources.

The reason the act was passed, in the first place, was that we found the 2,200 Osage Indians enrolled had dwindled to about 1,600, and they were receiving average amounts of \$10,000 or \$12,000 annually, all of which was being squandered. In addition to that we found, in our investigation of 1920, that they had gone \$1,300,000 in debt. Now, that debt has been cleaned up.

We have set aside, as I said before, for those who stayed under the jurisdiction of the bureau about \$17,000,000, and if all of them had remained under that same jurisdiction there would be at least \$40,000,000 now on deposit for the Osage Indians.

The Osage Reservation contains approximately 1,465,000 acres. The surface of the land is allotted to 2,229 enrolled Indians, about 650 acres each. The oil and gas thereunder is reserved to tribe until 1946, leased at public auction under department. The entire reservation is leased for gas in large tracts at 3 cents per 1,000 cubic feet. The annual gas royalties are about \$900,000. Approximately 510,000 acres are leased for oil in 160-acre tracts, all royalties fixed by President at one-sixth and one-fifth where oil wells on each tract average 100 barrels in 30 days.

From April, 1916, to April, 1924, there was sold at 20 auction sales 528,383 acres for bonus aggregating \$90,438,856. Oil produced from 1901 to July 1, 1923, aggregated 223,022,666 barrels. The total revenues such period from oil and gas aggregated approximately \$142,240,000, of which 151,215,000 barrels was produced from 1916, and revenues therefrom aggregated \$136,366,388, part of which bonus was not yet due.

In the Osage Reservation there are now 8,755 producing oil wells and 749 gas wells operated under close supervision of the department. The Burbank oil field, covering about 16,000 acres in the Osage, has produced from May, 1920, when first well drilled, to March 1, 1924, approximately 62,000,000 barrels of oil. The total present Osage production is about 100,000 barrels.

From March 18 and 19, 1924, there was sold 51,142 acres for oil leases in 160-acre tracts for \$14,193,800. Six tracts in Burbank fields selling for over \$1,500,000 each, the highest tract bringing \$1,990,000, the largest bonus known to have been paid for the privilege of securing oil lease on 160-acre nonproducing lands.

Receipts for the year ended June 30, 1923, were \$31,417,628; disbursements, \$28,829,747; total, \$60,247,375. Receipts from July 1, 1915, to June 30, 1923, \$124,585,388; disbursements, \$108,030,904. Receipts for month of March, 1924, from various sources aggregated \$10,753,916, of which \$7,475,000 was revenue from oil and gas.

Per capita payments were made to Indians from oil and gas revenues for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, \$12,400 to those having certificates. Restricted adults were paid \$4,000, and parents of minors \$2,000 of minors' shares, the balance retained to their credit. At present they have a credit of \$17,500,000, \$10,000,000 being in banks at 4 and 4½ per cent interest, and \$7,500,000 in Liberty bonds.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield. I yield five minutes more to myself.

Mr. BLANTON. I notice that the committee has recommended the bill. If these Indians who have guardians have had their estates squandered, why not limit their control to the bureau?

Mr. SNYDER. It has been limited to the bureau. You will find that when the guardian is limited to each quarter that will not be the case.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to my colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. McKEOWN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I am not opposed to legislation which has for its purpose the conservation of the property of incompetent Indians. I never have taken that position. I will not take that position on this floor. But I do take the position here, gentlemen, that you are passing a bill under suspension of the rules which does not permit an amendment to be made, and which is so far-reaching that I appeal to your fairness to decide whether or not you believe that a measure of this kind should be enacted to affect people in your State.

I have no fault to find with a policy that limits the amount per quarter to be paid to the incompetent Indian, but I do object to a proposition that gives dual government and which necessarily results in conflict in carrying on and carrying out of the administration of these estates.

What does this bill do? This bill provides that all payments to the legal guardians of the Osage Indians shall be made subject to the joint control and approval in writing of the courts and of the superintendent of the agency. What do you have under that provision? You have the guardian in a State court, who submits his accounts to the probate judge for his approval and the probate judge approves the account; and then you have it submitted to the Osage Indian Agency, and forsooth, if the agency should not approve the account, then you have a guardian under the court with an account approved and the department disapproving, and the result is that a man who deals with an Indian does not know what he is doing or what to expect.

Why, gentlemen, experience in Oklahoma has shown that the delay in the settlement of Indian affairs, so far as the settlement of Indian estates is concerned, is due entirely to the fact that the department has delayed until the condition is this—and I make the statement without fear of successful contradiction—that under this bill a full-blood Osage Indian, with \$10,000 cash in the Treasury of the United States, could not contract for a doctor to wait upon him; he could not contract for a hospital bill; and he could not make a lawful contract to have himself laid away decently after his death.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. SNYDER. The Osage Council has indorsed this bill, has it not?

Mr. McKEOWN. I understand it has.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. But it has also indorsed the compromise bill.

Mr. McKEOWN. I say that whenever the department has the control of an Indian's money, or anybody else has control of it, they can make him do any kind of indorsing they please, because he wants to get as much money as he can and spend it as freely as he can.

I have no fault to find with the Indian Committee when they attempt to conserve the estates of these Indians. But look where this bill goes. All I ask you to do is to vote this bill down under suspension of the rule and give us an opportunity to amend it so as to make it a workable bill in Oklahoma.

Mr. DALLINGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. DALLINGER. If the gentleman from Oklahoma had not objected to its consideration, it could have been amended, could it not?

Mr. McKEOWN. We would not have had any chance to amend it; it would have gone through right off the reel by a majority vote. I do not discount the ability of the gentleman from New York to pass bills of this House. I have been here before and I know his ability to pass these Indian bills.

I want to show you what they can not do under this bill:

No guardian shall be appointed except on the written application of the Secretary of the Interior for the estate of a member of the Osage Tribe of Indians.

Nobody may be appointed unless the department shall approve the application. Are you going to do away with the wholesome laws of the State of Oklahoma, which provide that the parents of a child shall have priority in the right to nominate the guardian of their child. The State of Oklahoma has extended to these Indians every right of a citizen of Oklahoma. They have the right to vote, and we have thrown around them by law every possible protection. The last legislature passed a law to protect their estates. Now, gentlemen, with all of this protection thrown around them you are going to deny them the privileges extended to them by the laws of the State of Oklahoma. I say the bill ought to be amended.

Let me show you something else in the bill. Here is something else that ought to be amended:

All funds of Osage Indians accruing to their credit and which are subject to supervision as above provided may, when deemed to be for the best interest of such Indians, be paid to the administrators of the estates of deceased Osage Indians or direct to their heirs, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, under regulations to be promulgated by him.

Why, gentlemen, that language permits the Secretary of the Interior to pass on the question of heirship of deceased Osage Indians, and although the courts of Oklahoma may determine who the lawful heirs of an Indian are, the Secretary of the Interior can disregard it, and will disregard it in some instances, and pay it out, and there is no recourse to the heir who is entitled to the money. I have seen cases where it has already been done in other tribes.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKEOWN. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. BLANTON. The chairman of the Indian Committee said in one breath that the several guardians were dissipating the estates and then in the next breath he says that the committee has stopped that by giving them only \$1,000 a quarter. That would be \$4,000 a year, and it occurs to me that a civil guardian who was inclined to dissipate an estate could dissipate a pretty good sum out of \$4,000 a year.

Mr. SNYDER. But these Indians get \$12,000 a year.

Mr. McKEOWN. I will say to the gentleman from Texas—and I know he wants to be fair—that we have laws in the State of Oklahoma which are ample to require guardians to account; we require them to be placed under bond; but I want to say to the gentleman from Texas that this bill is so far-reaching that it simply wipes out the probate courts of Oklahoma so far as Osage County is concerned. And it does more. It goes further than any bill I have ever seen with respect to the probate courts of Oklahoma.

Mr. SNYDER. But the gentleman will admit it only refers to Osage Indians and Osage County. And, if the gentleman will permit, I will state this: That there is a bill now on the calendar asking for an investigation on account of the very bad practices of your guardians out there.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. McKEOWN. May I have two minutes more?

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized for two additional minutes.

Mr. McKEOWN. I will say to the gentleman from New York that when the investigation is made and the record is printed it will show that if there have been any outrages permitted in the probate courts of Oklahoma they have been permitted with full knowledge and under the supervision of the representatives of the department. The truth is that these so-called exaggerated cases will fall flat whenever they are brought into this House, and the Members of this House shall know all the circumstances.

I am asking the House not to vote this bill through under suspension of the rules, because we have no opportunity to amend this bill, and I contend it ought to be amended so that we can pass it correctly.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Do not the courts of Oklahoma now have jurisdiction of the probate cases of Indians?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes; they have jurisdiction, and we have a statute which is as strong as the statute of any State in the Union, and that statute properly protects these people. I claim that the supervision provided in this bill will be a greater detriment to the Indians themselves.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, four years ago I went with the Committee on Indian Affairs to Oklahoma, where we very carefully examined into the condition of the Osage Tribe of Indians. We found the Osages to be the richest group of people in the world, with the largest individual income, and yet that money was not giving many of them the comforts of life which they ought to have, because much of it was being dissipated. Congress subsequently passed an act which we thought would properly conserve their property, but in order to avoid the law many of the Osage Indians had guardians appointed in the courts of Oklahoma. Through these guardianships they have been able to obtain more money than they ought to have, and their money is still being dissipated.

The time will come when the oil resources of the Osage Reservation will be gone, and unless we conserve the money that now comes from the oil and create a fund that can care for these Indians, there will be many paupers among them to be cared for ultimately by the State of Oklahoma.

Mr. McKEOWN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. My time is so limited that I am sorry I can not yield.

Under this bill we have liberalized the sums of money that can be paid to each member of the tribe. We have made it unlimited with respect to Indians who are sick or who need urgent and immediate help, and have made \$10,000 available to build each or any of them homes, and yet under the terms of the bill their property will be conserved for them. For these reasons, without discussing its terms, I want to urge the Members of the House to vote for the bill, and I hope it will be adopted to-day.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER].

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I regret finding myself in disagreement with some of my colleagues from my home State, for I have learned to have a very high regard for each of them, and it is unfortunate that we have not been able to bring our views in harmony; but I can not agree with those opposing this legislation. The Osages are the wealthiest people in the world. They draw from \$10,000 to \$12,000 per annum, man, woman, and child, every year. For that reason the most careful restrictions should be placed around these funds. Under the provisions of this bill each man, woman, and child will get \$1,000 of this \$12,000 per quarter. This would mean \$3,000 per quarter for a family of three. In addition to that, they are allowed \$10,000 to be expended for building homes, and the allowance with reference to sickness is unlimited; any available amount can be used for that purpose. The only place in which this bill touches the court jurisdiction of the State of Oklahoma is on page 5, wherein it is provided that money may be paid to the legal guardian or direct to such Indian in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior. Under the present law the Secretary must pay the money to the guardian. Under this bill he can pay it direct to the Indian if he thinks that is the best procedure. It does not materially interfere with the jurisdiction of the courts. It simply makes that change and applies the same procedure to the Osages that is now applied to the Five Civilized Tribes who, while far greater in numbers and somewhat more advanced in what we call civilization, have a great deal less money. I sincerely hope the House will adopt the bill. [Applause.]

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma has eight minutes.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Record.

Mr. CARTER. I ask the same privilege, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SNYDER. I make the same request, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BLANTON. And I make the same request, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to any of these requests? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, on this measure I occupy a rather unique position. I am the only Representative in this House who represents these Indians in Congress or any of the property affected, and yet I know that through the great power of the Indian Bureau, the prejudice that they have built up against the courts of Oklahoma and the citizens of Oklahoma who oppose this measure, that it is going to be passed this afternoon. I also recognize that under the parliamentary situation where a measure of great importance like this is rushed through with only 20 minutes of debate that myself and those who are opposed to this measure can not with any degree of satisfaction discuss it and give to you the information you should have before you vote. But I come to you appealing and asking as the Representative from the district most vitally affected by this legislation that you do not do this great injustice to these Indians and this community simply because the Bureau of Indian Affairs is seeking to gather greater power through the passage of this bill. There is no demand for this legislation; no necessity for it, except the demand of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and a few of its employees, and in the consideration of this measure I want to sound a warning to the Congress and to the people of the country. Too much legislation like this reaching into the powers of the States and interfering with the inherent rights of the citizens and the States is being introduced by these bureaucratic bureaus and passed by the Congress. Already we have gone so far in this class of legislation that the washerwoman can not ply her trade, the mechanic can not carry on in his trade, and the shepherd can not herd his sheep in peace on the hillside without having some representative of the Federal Government there to dictate to him and make reports on him to the Federal Government later. This bureaucratic practice in Federal Government, such as is attempted by the Indian Bureau in this bill, has reached such a point in this Nation that the citizen of the United States can not longer sing the songs of liberty until he has obtained a clearance card from some Federal bureau or department in Washington.

This bill has not been demanded by anybody except the Bureau of Indian Affairs. They come to you with their sob stories about how the courts of Oklahoma have mistreated the Indians, but they only tell you half of the story. They do not give you an opportunity to know of the waste and dissipation, through favoritism and negligence at least, that has been brought about by the miserable handling of the Indian affairs by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and through their autocratic power they will not give the Congress an opportunity to investigate—this being evidenced by the fact of the impossibility of passing through this Congress a resolution now pending providing for a thorough investigation. They tell you about how much of the money of the Indian has been spent through the courts and guardians in Oklahoma, but make to you no report of their handling of the Indian's financial affairs. They do not tell you that the Osage Indian, who since March 3, 1921, has been entirely under the jurisdiction of the bureau, has created debts amounting to \$260,000, which, in the bureaucratic manner of the Indian Bureau, they refuse to recognize or to pay. They do not give us an opportunity to, by comparison, judge whether or not if the just debts of these Indians were paid that their estates would have been just as much depleted as have those under guardianships they are referring to. They do not tell you that not a man has appeared at the hearing before the committee in behalf of this bill except those who are interested, directly or indirectly, in the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman tell the membership of the House who are opposed to the bill?

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. The citizenship of Osage County and all other Oklahomans who know the real facts and conditions.

Mr. SNYDER. No one is opposed to it, so far as I have been able to discover, except the bar association, which constitutes 90 per cent of the guardians and their counsel.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. I want to say to you that I have just returned from Oklahoma, and only last Friday and Saturday I saw telegrams sent from Washington to banks that have Osage money on deposit saying in substance, "If you do not quit protesting against the Snyder bill, we will withdraw this money out of your bank." There has not been any opportunity for the citizens of Oklahoma interested in this bill to get a hearing on this matter.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman put one of these telegrams in the Record?

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. I have not them with me, but I have seen them, and they will be, I understand, put in the Record in the Senate.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman yield? Did I understand the gentleman to say that those telegrams were sent from Washington?

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Yes; and also to citizens, threatening legislation in this body if these protests were not withdrawn.

Mr. HUDSPETH. From officials of the Government?

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Oh, of course not. We know how these autocratic bureaus do these things. They would not dare send these telegrams themselves, but every man on this floor knows how through their influence they can be sent, and they were sent from people from Oklahoma in Washington close to and working with the Indian Bureau in favor of this legislation. Everybody understands a situation like this and can read between the lines.

Mr. SNYDER. That is a very different statement; the gentleman started out with the statement that the telegrams were from the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. I did not so state.

Mr. SNYDER. That is what I understood.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. I never said anything that would give the gentleman any such understanding, but am trying to impress upon the Congress the power that the bureau has and is exercising in this matter. There is not a man who is in trade or in business in Osage County or who is connected with any financial institution in which Osage moneys are deposited who dares to raise his voice in protest. If the Congress will send a committee out there empowered to question and protect the citizens from the autocracy of this department, you will find a very different situation to that presented to the committee by the friends of this measure.

What is the demand for this legislation? The Osage Indian you have been told approves of this bill. The chief of the Osage Tribe and other members have told me that they do not approve of it. They did approve of and give me a compromise bill, which the chairman of the Indian Affairs Committee refused to take into consideration. They were told that if they came to Washington legislation would be passed that would give them more of their own money, but in this measure they are worse hampered and placed more at the mercy of an autocratic bureau 1,500 miles away from them than they are under present conditions. It is the Osage Indian that is going to suffer most in the end from this legislation. He owns most of the land in Osage County. This land is taxable. From much of it is being taken this great natural resource. There is a probability that this land will ultimately yield \$100,000,000. This money could be used so as to build up the community in which the Osage Indian's land is located and thereby increase the value of his land and assist in holding the taxes on it to the minimum. Under this measure this will not be done. The Commissioner of Indian Affairs has testified that the money should be invested in Government bonds. What will be the result? The natural resources will be taken out of the country and put into Government bonds; they will not be used to build up the community, with the result that when the oil is gone, when the great income from it has ceased, the community will not have been built up by reason of this great natural resource; the community will have been depleted without the benefit of the revenues that come from that depletion; consequently the Indian will find himself with his income stopped, the value of his property less, and the taxes upon it higher. Under present conditions the guardians, which they are expecting in this bill to do away with, are investing the money in building and loan stock, in first mortgage and real estate loans, where not only the community is benefited but agriculture assisted, and on these funds the Indian through these guardianship loans is earning from 6 to 7 and 8 per cent net on his investment, while if his money is invested by the department, as is contemplated, it will bring not over 3½ to 4 per cent, thus entailing an annual loss to the Osage Indians. I know of some investments in

building and loan stock by guardians that are drawing the Indian from 6 to 10 per cent, and where already these investments have increased in value from 15 to 20 per cent. The passage of this measure will exclude the Indians from receiving benefits such as this, take the money from their own community, and put them back where they were 25 years ago. Under the present system their money is being invested where it is building up their own community and helping to pay the taxes of that community. There is where it should be invested and where you would want it invested if this was in your district instead of mine.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS].

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I crave your indulgence a few minutes while I talk upon this bill. I ask not to be interrupted, for I have only a few minutes. I hope to make a comprehensive statement, and I have every confidence that if I could have the attention of all the Members of this House and sufficient time to explain the provisions of this bill there would not be a vote against it.

This bill should receive the unanimous support of this House. The Indian Committee gave a great deal of consideration to Osage affairs four years ago when it visited Pawhuska, Okla., and took testimony there on the ground. We began the consideration of the pending bill on the 25th day of January, 1924, and the hearings are in two volumes comprising 389 printed pages of testimony and argument. After six weeks of consideration by the entire membership of the Committee on Indian Affairs, after we had heard those in favor of it, after we had heard the Indian Bureau and the Indians themselves and those who were opposed to the bill, there was no minority report filed and none requested to be filed. I violate no secret of the Committee on Indian Affairs when I say that every man around the table on both sides except my colleague [Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma] voted to favorably report this bill.

Gentlemen of the House, do you think this is a very bad bill, after six weeks' careful investigation, going over it line by line and section by section, after having heard everybody for and against it? Do you believe it is a bad bill when every member of the committee except one voted to favorably report it, and there was no minority report? Surely if there was any objection to the bill on principle or to any of the phraseology in the bill, those who were heard to object to it would have been able to have pointed it out to the members of the committee and should have been able to have induced some one to make a minority report. The truth is no legitimate argument can be made against this bill, as none was advanced before the committee.

I have not the time to discuss the bill as I would like, but let me say that the Osage Indians occupy Osage County in Oklahoma, just south of the Kansas line. They purchased their reservation, consisting of approximately 1,500,000 acres, from the Cherokees in 1870 and have occupied it continuously since that date. In 1906 they made an agreement with the Government of the United States for the survey and allotment of their land, reserving the oil and gas rights to the tribe. The rolls were made as of July 1, 1907, and there were 2,229 enrolled members of the Osage Tribe. Their lands were allotted, and each enrolled member was permitted to take four allotment selections, aggregating 657½ acres of land. Great lakes of oil have been discovered underneath this land, and the same is being developed. Last year each Osage Indian received as his share from the sale of oil and oil leases \$11,800. These people are being seriously menaced by their own wealth. After an exhaustive investigation we tried to protect them by the act of March 3, 1921, known as the Osage extension act, when the mineral period, including oil and gas, was extended for 25 years, expiring in 1946. We endeavored then in that act to limit the amount of money to be paid each adult Osage Indian to \$1,000 a quarter and \$500 for each of the enrolled minor children. We also provided for the payment of their accumulated debts. You will doubtless be amazed when I tell you that it subsequently developed that the restricted Osage Indians were found to be indebted more than \$1,300,000. This amount was paid out of the funds of these Indians by the superintendent for the Osage Agency. Since then they have contracted debts to the amount of \$260,000.

The act of 1921 provided that all moneys due to Indians having certificates of competency—in other words, unrestricted—should be paid over to them direct. This was done. Unfortunately there was a provision in the act of 1921 directing that the department should pay to all Indians having guardians their share through their guardians. At that time it was not

known to Congress that guardians were being appointed for adult full-blood Indians. As a mere subterfuge and in order that they might get additional allowances over and above the \$1,000 per quarter, these poor unfortunate, improvident, adult Indians, induced and assisted by white people, permitted applications to be made to the county court to have guardians appointed for them, in order, as above stated, that they might have all of their money in the hands of the Indian Bureau turned over to their guardians and squandered. That is, exactly what was done. I do not hesitate to say that in my judgment this is the blackest chapter that has ever been written in the history of these Indians.

I do not have time to go into all the details. These Indians were not adjudged non compos mentis. They are restricted full-blood Osage Indians. Of the 2,229 originally enrolled there are approximately 1,600 living, and of these some 600 are restricted Indians. Four hundred and thirty-five of these adult restricted Indians had guardians appointed. These guardians received all of their money—not only the annual share of approximately \$10,000 each, but all of the accumulated moneys in the hands of the Government officials, which in many cases amounted to a vast sum. While it may be an extravagant statement to say that these guardians have dissipated it all, in effect they have dissipated most or approximately all of this money, some ten or twelve thousand dollars a year.

The share of each Osage amounts to some ten or twelve thousand dollars a year. You can readily see the interest of these professional guardians. They do not want to be interfered with, nor do their attorneys who represent them. They do not want to be relieved of their business. They regard it as perfectly legitimate. They do not perform any beneficial services whatsoever. There can be no excuse for their appointments in the first place nor for their continuance. The county seat is at Pawhuska, Okla., and the disbursing office is within sight and a stone's throw. Why should this money be paid first to the guardian who in turn pays it to the adult Indian, not however, before taking a heavy toll of approximately \$1,100 per year, in addition to attorney's fees of \$250 basic fee with additional allowance in almost every case aggregating five or six hundred dollars? Why not permit the disbursing officer to pay it direct to the Indian and let the Indian have some experience in spending it? It is argued that the guardians could invest this money at a larger rate than Government or State bonds pay or than is paid on time certificates of deposit. The answer to that is that in not a single case submitted to the committee has the amount received by a guardian increased, but approximately all, regardless of the amount, dissipated. Suppose the guardian received 8, 10, or 20 per cent, what benefit would it be to the Indian if it were all squandered? Of course these guardians and their attorneys do not want this legislation enacted.

The hearings show a few more than 600 living full-blood restricted adult Osage Indians, 435 of whom have guardians and approximately 200 do not have guardians, but their allowances of \$1,000 per quarter were paid direct by the disbursing officer for the Osage Agency. These 200 Indians have now to their credit in money and bonds \$12,000,000, an average of \$6,000 each. If no guardians had been appointed for the other 435 but their allowances had been paid to them direct they should have to their credit the same proportion or \$26,100,000. While the exact amount is not known because current reports in all cases were not made, the amount to their credit is small in comparison. Practically all has been improvidently expended.

Oil leases on only approximately one-third of their lands have been sold. On March 18 and 19, 1924, leases on about 100,000 acres additional were sold for more than \$14,000,000, which will increase the shares of each enrolled Osage approximately \$7,000. After the leases on the remaining land are sold and the oil developed the shares of each Osage should be greatly increased, which emphasizes the necessity for protective legislation.

What does the bill provide? As you noticed, my colleague, Mr. HOWARD, did not debate the details of the pending bill at all. He talked about the Indian Bureau and tried to arouse your prejudice against the action of the bureau in Oklahoma. He talked very little about the Osages. I believe we should stick to our text. Let us examine the details of this bill, and see if there could be any legitimate objections. But before doing this let me say neither can opposition to this bill be justified on the ground that it was brought up under a motion to suspend the rules, for the reason that the bill was placed upon the Consent Calendar and called up for consideration on Monday, March 17, when objection was made, and it was called

up again for consideration to-day, when, if three objections had not been made, time would have been given for amendment and debate, but inasmuch as objections were made to the consideration of the bill, the chairman was forced, in order to get consideration, to appeal to the Chair to be recognized to move to suspend the rules and to pass the bill because there is urgent need for the enactment of this legislation.

Nor should we be diverted to a comparison with the Five Civilized Tribes. Conditions are entirely different. The Osages occupy one county, their money is disbursed at the county seat, Pawhuska, their affairs are paid out of their own funds, they have an entirely different business experience, whereas the Five Civilized Tribes are scattered over 40 counties, many of them remote from the office of the Superintendent of the Five Civilized Tribes, they do not have guardians for adult restricted Indians, their funds are now being paid direct to them, they have managed their own affairs for a century, they occupy an entirely different status, and are governed by different laws. In this discussion let us confine ourselves to the Osage Indian.

This bill provides liberally for the Osages. It goes further than I wanted it to go. It is no secret that I wanted to eliminate every one of those guardians of restricted adult Indians not adjudged non compos mentis. They do not have them personally in charge. It should be enacted, however, as it was the best bill that all of the members of the committee could unite upon and report.

In the first place, let us eliminate from consideration the Osage Indians to whom certificates of competency have been issued. They are turned loose from all supervision whatsoever. All of their money, much or little, is turned over to them quarterly. This bill directs to be paid to every restricted adult Osage Indian \$1,000 quarterly. If the man's wife is enrolled, she also gets \$1,000 quarterly, and each enrolled child or one having an inherited interest gets \$1,000 per quarter. To a family of three that amounts to \$3,000 a quarter. The bill also provides that there may be paid to each, in addition to the above allowance, \$500 a quarter from their agricultural rents and interest from their investments, and that would amount to \$1,500 additional per quarter—in all, \$18,000 per annum for a family of three. In addition allowances may be made of \$500 per quarter for the keeping of unenrolled minor members of the family.

Surely the bill can not be criticized as not being liberal enough in the allowance of money. It is urged, however, by the unthinking and by the more improvident Indians themselves that this is their money and that, therefore, they should be allowed to do as they please with it, and that it is no concern of the Government nor of Congress if they spend it in dissipation and riotous living. When we consider that these Indians are the wards of the Government and that we as Members of Congress, in the consideration of this legislation are the guardians of these primitive people, surely this argument does not need an answer. The truth is, not much can be done for the old adult Osage Indian who has passed the meridian of life and who faces the setting sun. The current of his life can not be greatly changed. Doubtless he will be permitted to drift down the stream of life supervised and protected as best we can until he reaches the great sea beyond and is finally received into the happy hunting ground.

Our greatest concern, however, should be for the young Indians. What is our duty toward them? Shall we permit them to grow up in ease and thriftless luxury and be despoiled in their own excesses and vices, or shall we regard them as human beings and attempt to restrict them in the too liberal use of money and endeavor to direct their lives into the paths of honorable and productive citizenship? The situation in Osage County is not pleasant to contemplate. These Osages have a splendid school—beautifully located in their capital of Pawhuska, on a high elevation overlooking the city. Congress appropriates from Osage funds annually for its upkeep and maintenance. It has been discontinued for the past two years. These children remain with their parents and spend their time where the discipline is lax and where attendance upon the day schools is admittedly very irregular. The testimony shows that not one single young full-blood Osage Indian is pursuing a gainful occupation. Not one can be pointed to as a productive citizen. The thought that has always burned my brain has been that the thing that was uppermost to consider with reference to all Indians of all tribes was the conservation of the Indian, his development into a productive, patriotic citizen, rather than the conservation of his money. With the Osages, the continued extravagant expenditure of their money so as to permit them to live as they have lived the past few years means the destruction of every young boy and girl born to the full-blood members

of the tribe. What a pity it is that some of the full-blood members of the tribe may not be developed, so that they will be pointed to with pride as members of a dying race in the years to come! Knowing this to be true, I insisted in 1921 upon restricting them in the too liberal expenditure of their money. It is the history of every child—Indian or white—in the land. If they are permitted to grow up without discipline and with an unlimited allowance of money, none of them make the men and women of whom our Nation is proud.

In addition, the bill provides that under the supervision of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, or the Secretary of the Interior, \$10,000 may be spent for the purchase or improvement of a home. It also provides that an unlimited amount may be expended for those suffering with tuberculosis or any lingering disease.

As above stated, the truth is these people are despoiling themselves with their own money. Conditions at Pawhuska are similar to those of western mining towns. All sorts of people—good and bad, reputable and disreputable, moral and immoral—are attracted there by the advertised wealth of these Osage Indians. Of course, there are many splendid men and women there. There are also many who go there to prey upon these helpless, improvident Indians.

Mr. CARTER. And what happens when this \$12,000 is all turned over to these primitive, incompetent people?

Mr. HASTINGS. It is in a very large measure squandered.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS. No; I can not yield.

There is no necessity for a guardian for these adult Osage Indians. As previously stated, they live in Osage County, near Pawhuska, Okla. That is the county seat. The Osage Agency is located there and their money is disbursed there by a Federal official. All of the expenses of supervising these Indians and of managing their affairs—every penny of it is appropriated by Congress out of the Osage tribal funds. Not a dollar is appropriated from the Federal Treasury. What is the necessity of paying this money through a guardian to one of these adult Osage Indians? The testimony before the committee showed that the fees of these guardians on an average were \$1,100 a year. Some 25 or more typical cases were presented. They spend as much as \$10,000 in burying one of these Indians. All sorts of extravagances are indulged in.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS. No; I can not yield. The young Indians are being despoiled by conditions that prevail there. Some of them have more than one share. Some have five or six inherited shares. I hesitate to make public and to invite to your attention some of the outrages that are being perpetrated, but publicity will arouse the conscience of the Members of this House and of the country. Many of the good people do not know what is going on. The people of my State do not indorse or approve it. Very few in my own State really know the facts. To show you how these people are being despoiled, let me cite you one, perhaps an extreme case. It illustrates conditions.

One Indian girl has $8\frac{1}{2}$ shares. If she had been paid all the money due her for the $8\frac{1}{2}$ shares last year, \$11,800 for each share, and agricultural rents in addition, that Indian girl would have received approximately \$100,000. Can you imagine what an outrage was perpetrated upon her? Supposed to be suffering from tuberculosis, her guardian sent her to Kansas City under the protection of a matron, when some of those people of Osage County who wanted to get her money conspired with a prize fighter, or boxer, in Osage County, took him to Kansas City, and getting this unfortunate woman under the influence of liquor, induced her to marry him. He had never seen the girl before. In fairness I will say that the marriage was subsequently annulled. Gentlemen of the House, that is the kind of testimony that was presented to the committee and compelled us to bring out this legislation for the further protection of the Osage Indians for your consideration.

This bill does not entirely ignore the guardian, as I would like, but it does permit the department to supervise these guardians, restricts payment to them in the sums mentioned in the bill, and authorizes the department to pay the money for the use of these Indians either to the guardians or direct to the Indians themselves. This does not change the probate law. It simply requires an honest administration of probate proceedings and a rigid accounting by guardians or else the guardians will be ignored.

The county court should welcome this assistance. It is their duty to protect these wards. Why should an honest guardian object? And if the guardian is not too scrupulous in the handling of the Indian's estate the more is the neces-

sity for the legislation. The bill does not take a cent from the Indians. It provides for the investment of all surplus moneys in Government bonds, State or school bonds, or placed at interest on time deposit in banks in accordance with existing law. It tries to preserve some of the vast wealth of the members for the benefit of future generations. Nor can it be urged that these Indians do not pay their taxes. That is not correct. They pay taxes upon all of their surplus lands, and in addition to the gross production tax required to be paid by other citizens they pay 1 per cent additional to be used for road building in Osage County. They are, therefore, helping develop the county and State by the use of their money.

It has been asserted that the enactment of this bill will not be to the best interest of the business interests or assist in the development of Osage County. Its passage should be welcomed for that very reason. It is, of course, to the advantage of the business interests in Osage County to have Osage money paid out properly and in an orderly way and expended for food, clothing, the necessities of life for adult Indians, and for the education and maintenance of the minor Indians, and for the purchase and improvement of homes for all than to have the money improvidently spent and wasted through sewers of vice. The money conserved will be, in a large measure, placed in banks on time deposits available to be loaned for legitimate purposes in the development of the surrounding country.

This bill also prevents these improvident Indians from running all sorts of extravagant accounts. Immediately after the act of 1921 was passed \$1,300,000 of their accounts were paid. Guardians for these adult restricted Indians have subsequently paid immense sums on accounts not recognized by the department. That is another excuse for the appointment of these guardians. It is said that there are 210 of these guardians and in all 435 guardianships. Some of them have four or five guardianship cases. In some cases the wife is the guardian and the husband is the attorney. These facts are a matter of common knowledge in Oklahoma, and the testimony taken before the committee sustains it, and it is in fact not denied.

Surely no one who knows the facts can withhold his assent in behalf of legislation that has for its purpose the further protection of these Indians. This bill prevents the restricted Indians from selling or encumbering their lands without consent of the department. Wills are invalid unless so approved. What sections or provisions of the bill have been invited to our attention which should be amended or which is not to the best interest of these improvident Indians? Many of them know nothing of the value of money or property. To state these things to the membership of this House compels an affirmative response.

I have endeavored to indicate my objections to this bill: (1) The recognition of any guardians of adult Indians not of unsound mind; and (2) the allowances are too liberal. I yielded in part to the judgment of the other members of the committee. In the event this bill is enacted into law, I warn the administrative officers against these defects in order that in future years no one can point an accusing finger to my record upon this question and charge that, knowing conditions, I did not invite attention to them.

I appeal to the House, if you want to protect these Indians, if you want to deal fairly with them, if the Government is to be the guardian of these Indians, to pass this bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Will this bill protect them?

Mr. HASTINGS. It will if the Government officials charged with the administration of it will do their duty.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNYDER] to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is not. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will bring in absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNYDER] to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 226, nays 64, answered "present" 2, not voting 140, as follows:

YEAS—226

Abernethy	Bacon	Boles	Bulwinkle
Ackerman	Barbour	Box	Burtess
Aldrich	Beck	Brand, Ohio	Busby
Allen	Beedy	Briggs	Butler
Andrew	Begg	Browne, N. J.	Cable
Anthony	Bixler	Browne, Wis.	Campbell
Arnold	Black, Tex.	Buchanan	Carter
Aswell	Blanton	Buckley	Casey

Chindblom	Hadley	Major, Mo.	Sites
Clarke, N. Y.	Hardy	Mapes	Smith
Cole, Iowa	Hastings	Martin	Smithwick
Cole, Ohio	Hawley	Merritt	Snell
Collins	Hayden	Michener	Snyder
Colton	Hersey	Miller, Wash.	Speaks
Cook	Hickey	Mills	Stalker
Cooper, Ohio	Hill, Md.	Moore, Ohio	Stedman
Crisp	Hill, Wash.	Moore, Ind.	Stephens
Crowther	Hooker	Morehead	Stevenson
Cummings	Huddleston	Morgan	Strong, Kans.
Dallinger	Hudspeth	Morrow	Strong, Pa.
Darrow	Hull, Iowa	Murphy	Sumners, Tex.
Davis, Minn.	Hull, William E.	Nelson, Me.	Swing
Deal	Jacobstein	Newton, Minn.	Swoope
Dickinson, Iowa	James	Newton, Mo.	Taylor, Tenn.
Doughton	Jeffers	Nolan	Temple
Dowell	Johnson, S. Dak.	O'Connell, R. I.	Thatcher
Drewry	Johnson, Tex.	Oliver, Ala.	Thompson
Driver	Johnson, Wash.	Park, Ga.	Timberlake
Dyer	Johnson, W. Va.	Peavey	Tincher
Elliot	Keller	Peery	Tinkham
Evans, Iowa	Kendall	Perkins	Treadway
Evans, Mont.	Kerr	Phillips	Tucker
Fairchild	Ketcham	Porter	Tydings
Fairfield	Kincheloe	Prall	Underwood
Faust	King	Purnell	Upshaw
Favrot	Kopp	Rainey	Vaile
Fenn	Kvale	Raker	Vincent, Mich.
Fish	LaGuardia	Ramseyer	Vinson, Ga.
Fisher	Lampert	Rayburn	Vinson, Ky.
Fitzgerald	Lanham	Reece	Wainwright
Fleetwood	Lea, Calif.	Reid, Ill.	Ward, N. Y.
Foster	Leatherwood	Richards	Ward, N. C.
Fredericks	Leavitt	Roach	Watkins
Freeman	Linthicum	Robinson, Iowa	Watson
French	Logan	Robison, Ky.	Weaver
Frothingham	Longworth	Rogers, Mass.	White, Kans.
Fuller	Lowrey	Rogers, N. H.	Williams, Mich.
Garber	Luce	Sanders, N. Y.	Williamson
Gardner, Ind.	McKenzie	Sandlin	Wilson, Ind.
Garner, Tex.	McLaughlin, Mich.	Schneider	Wilson, La.
Garrett, Tenn.	McLeod	Sears, Nebr.	Winter
Gifford	McReynolds	Seeger	Woodruff
Glatfelter	McSweeney	Shallenberger	Wright
Green, Iowa	MacGregor	Sherwood	Yates
Greene, Mass.	Madden	Shreve	Young
Greenwood	Magee, N. Y.	Simmons	
Griest	Major, Ill.	Sinnott	

NAYS—64

Allgood	Gallivan	Lyon	Rankin
Almon	Garrett, Tex.	McKeown	Romjue
Barkley	Gasque	McSwain	Rubey
Bell	Hammer	Mansfield	Sabath
Bowling	Harrison	Mead	Sanders, Tex.
Boyce	Hill, Ala.	Milligan	Stegall
Browning	Howard, Nebr.	Minahan	Stengle
Burton	Howard, Okla.	Mooney	Swank
Byrns, Tenn.	Johnson, Ky.	Moore, Ga.	Tague
Cannon	Jones	Moore, Va.	Thomas, Ky.
Connery	Kelly	O'Sullivan	Thomas, Okla.
Crosser	Kunz	Oldfield	Tillman
Dickinson, Mo.	Lankford	Oliver, N. Y.	Williams, Tex.
Free	Larsen, Ga.	Parks, Ark.	Wilson, Miss.
Fulbright	Lee, Ga.	Quin	Wingo
Fulmer	Lozier	Ragon	Wolf

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Pou Rouse

NOT VOTING—140

Anderson	Denison	Lehlbach	Rosenbloom
Ayres	Dickstein	Lilly	Salmon
Bacharach	Dominick	Lindsay	Sanders, Ind.
Bankhead	Doyle	Lineberger	Schafer
Beers	Drane	Little	Schall
Berger	Eagan	McClintic	Scott
Black, N. Y.	Edmonds	McDuffie	Sears, Fla.
Bland	Frear	McFadden	Sinclair
Bloom	Funk	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Sproul, Ill.
Boylan	Geran	McNulty	Sproul, Kans.
Brand, Ga.	Gibson	MacLafferty	Sullivan
Britten	Gilbert	Magee, Pa.	Summers, Wash.
Brumm	Goldsbrough	Manlove	Sweet
Burdick	Graham, Ill.	Michaelson	Taber
Byrnes, S. C.	Graham, Pa.	Miller, Ill.	Taylor, Colo.
Canfield	Griffin	Montague	Taylor, W. Va.
Carew	Haugen	Moore, Ill.	Tilson
Celler	Hawes	Morin	Underhill
Christopherson	Hoch	Morris	Vare
Clague	Holaday	Mudd	Vestal
Clancy	Hudson	Nelson, Wis.	Voigt
Clark, Fla.	Hull, Morton D.	O'Brien	Wason
Cleary	Hull, Tenn.	O'Connell, N. Y.	Watres
Collier	Humphreys	O'Connor, La.	Wefald
Connally, Tex.	Jost	O'Connor, N. Y.	Weller
Connolly, Pa.	Kahn	Paige	Welsh
Cooper, Wis.	Kearns	Parker	Wertz
Corning	Kent	Patterson	White, Me.
Cramton	Kless	Periman	Williams, Ill.
Croll	Kindred	Quayle	Winslow
Cullen	Knutson	Ransley	Wood
Curry	Kurtz	Rathbone	Woodrum
Davey	Langley	Reed, Ark.	Wurzback
Davis, Tenn.	Larson, Minn.	Reed, N. Y.	Wyant
Dempsey	Lazaro	Reed, W. Va.	Zihlman

So, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Mr. Christopherson with Mr. Pou.
Mr. Wyant with Mr. Hull of Tennessee.
Mr. Cooper of Wisconsin with Mr. Lazaro.

Mr. Brumm with Mr. O'Connor of Louisiana.
Mr. Vestal with Mr. Bankhead.
Mr. Welsh with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.
Mr. Frear with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Manlove with Mr. Croll.
Mr. Wood with Mr. Gilbert.
Mr. Lehlbach with Mr. Bland.
Mr. Mudd with Mr. Humphreys.
Mr. Hoch with Mr. Montague.
Mr. Tilson with Mr. Taylor of West Virginia.
Mr. Wurzback with Mr. McNulty.
Mr. Nelson of Wisconsin with Mr. Connally of Texas.
Mr. Lineberger with Mr. Lilly.
Mr. Magee of Pennsylvania with Mr. Morris.
Mr. Curry with Mr. McDuffie.
Mr. Anderson with Mr. Reed of Arkansas.
Mr. Sproul of Kansas and Mr. O'Connell of New York.
Mr. Scott with Mr. Wefald.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will reopen the doors.

THE LATE HON. J. M. C. SMITH, OF MICHIGAN

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Sunday, April 27, be set aside for memorial addresses on the life, character, and public services of our late colleague, Hon. J. M. C. SMITH, of Michigan, and that the House meet at 11 o'clock on that day.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that Sunday, April 27, be set aside for memorial exercises on the late Mr. SMITH, of Michigan, and that the House meet at 11 o'clock on that day. Is there objection. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Welch, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to bills of the following titles:

S. 646. An act for the relief of Ethel Williams; and

S. 1861. An act authorizing the Court of Claims of the United States to hear and determine the claim of Elwood Grissinger.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 655) to provide for a tax on motor-vehicle fuels sold within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

PROVIDING FOR THE APPOINTMENT OF A SUPERINTENDENT AND TWO ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENTS OF DELIVERY IN CERTAIN POST OFFICES

The next bill on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 579) providing for the appointment of a superintendent and two assistant superintendents of delivery in certain post offices of the first class.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. I object.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR PAYMENT OF PURCHASE MONEY, FORT BERTHOLD INDIAN RESERVATION, N. DAK.

The next bill on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 4494) authorizing the extension of time for the payment of purchase money due under certain homestead entries and Government land purchases within the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation, N. Dak.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, who is interested in this bill?

Mr. WINTER. The bill is a bill of Mr. SINCLAIR, of North Dakota.

Mr. BEGG. Has this privilege been heretofore granted these same people prior to this time?

Mr. WINTER. As a class or individually?

Mr. BEGG. To these same individuals?

Mr. WINTER. I can not say whether it has affected the identical individuals or not.

Mr. BEGG. The bill is to extend the time for payment of their entry fees for improvements and also upon the land. Now, if the time be extended for a year, will that satisfy them and will they be able to get out of their present financial difficulties, or come back another year and want the same thing done over?

Mr. WINTER. It is believed very easily, and the belief of the committee is that a year will probably suffice, but the bill provides that in case that time is not sufficient that upon a proper showing it may be extended for a final limit of three years.

Mr. BEGG. I shall not object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any homestead entryman or purchaser of Government lands within the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation in North Dakota who is unable to make payment of purchase money due under his entry or contract of purchase as required by existing law or regulations, on application duly verified showing that he is unable to make payment as required, shall be granted an extension to the 1925 anniversary of the date of his entry or contract of purchase upon payment of interest in advance at the rate of 5 per cent per annum on the amounts due from the maturity thereof to the said anniversary; and if at the expiration of the extended period the entryman or purchaser is still unable to make the payment he may, upon the same terms and conditions, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, be granted such further extensions of time, not exceeding a period of three years, as the facts warrant.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

PARTICIPATION OF THE UNITED STATES IN TWO INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES FOR CONTROL OF NARCOTIC DRUGS

The next bill on the Consent Calendar was the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 195) authorizing an appropriation for the participation of the United States in two international conferences for the control of the traffic in habit-forming narcotic drugs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. This resolution embraces about three times as much money as should be spent on this trip. I am just as much in favor of the principle that is involved in this proposition as the gentleman or any other gentleman in this House, but in the name of these conferences we are going to waste a great deal of money. Is not the gentleman willing to cut it down by half, at least?

Mr. PORTER. Decidedly no.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, it requires two objections.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. I will object unless somebody explains it.

Mr. PORTER. I will say to the gentleman I intend to make a statement and explain the matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the joint resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 195) authorizing an appropriation for the participation of the United States in two international conferences for the control of the traffic in habit-forming narcotic drugs.

Whereas President Roosevelt on October 14, 1907, called an international commission, which met in Shanghai, China, in 1909, to make an investigation of the abuses growing out of the opium traffic and to suggest a means for their prevention, and thus the United States, as pointed out by President Wilson in his message to Congress on April 21, 1913, "initiated the world-wide movement toward" the abolition of the traffic in habit-forming narcotic drugs; and

Whereas the international conference at The Hague proposed by President Taft on September 1, 1909, to give international effect and sanction to the resolutions of the Shanghai opium commission resulted in the adoption of The Hague opium convention of 1912 by the powers assembled, which is in full force and effect between the nations which have ratified it; and

Whereas the original convention delegated certain administrative functions to the Netherlands Government (thereby constituting the said Government an agent for the execution of the treaty), and said Government called two conferences in 1913 and 1914 to consider problems growing out of the execution of the convention; and

Whereas certain of the powers parties thereto have vested in the League of Nations the agency or duty of executing the convention by treaty dated June 28, 1923, article 23 of which provides as follows: "Subject to and in accordance with the provisions of international conventions existing or hereafter to be agreed upon, the members of the league . . . will intrust the league with the general supervision over the execution of agreements with regard to . . . the traffic in opiums and other dangerous drugs . . ."; and

Whereas the United States, for the reasons that it is only by international cooperation that the suppression of the world-wide traffic in habit-forming narcotic drugs can be accomplished, and that this Government is bound by The Hague opium convention equally with other governments to work toward this end, accepted an invitation from said agency to cooperate with it in the execution of said treaty; and

Whereas as the result of conferences in January, May, and September of 1923, between the representatives of the United States and governments represented by the League of Nations, the latter govern-

ments agreed that the United States construction of The Hague opium convention, as provided in Public Resolution No. 96, Sixty-seventh Congress, approved March 2, 1923, represented the objects which the treaty was intended to accomplish, and that any other construction would render the treaty ineffective and of no practical value, and accordingly it was decided:

"1. If the purpose of The Hague opium convention is to be achieved according to its spirit and true intent, it must be recognized that the use of opium products for other than medical and scientific purposes is an abuse and not legitimate.

"2. In order to prevent the abuse of these products it is necessary to exercise the control of the production of raw opium in such a manner that there will be no surplus available for nonmedical and nonscientific purposes"; and

Whereas it was further decided at said conferences that two international conferences should be called in the latter part of the year 1924 to agree upon a plan to enforce said treaty in accordance with said construction and interpretation, bearing in mind that the gradual suppression of the traffic in and use of prepared opium as provided in Chapter II of the convention is not yet accomplished, reservations to that effect having been noted by certain powers (Great Britain, France, Germany, Netherlands, Japan, British India, and Siam, in regard to prepared opium): Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the appropriation of such sum as may be necessary, not to exceed \$40,000, for the participation of the United States in one or both of these conferences, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of State, is hereby authorized.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment: On page 3, line 1, of the resolving clause, after the word "*Resolved*," insert "*by the Senate and the House of Representatives in Congress assembled*."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PORTER: On page 3, line 1, after the word "*Resolved*," insert "*by the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled*."

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the letter of the Secretary of State be read in my time.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the letter will be read.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 9, 1924.

MY DEAR MR. PORTER: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of January 31, 1924, inclosing a copy of House Joint Resolution 162, authorizing the appropriation of the necessary funds for the participation of the United States in one or both of the international conferences for the control of the traffic in habit-forming narcotics.

This resolution has my full and unqualified approval, and I feel sure that its prompt passage is necessary to enable this Government to continue its efforts to obtain a complete international understanding in regard to the limitations which must be placed upon the production and dissemination of opium and coca leaves and their derivatives. The preamble to your resolution shows so fully the background of the narcotic situation that it is hardly necessary for me in this letter to state any further reasons for American participation in this work.

I may add, however, that for nearly 20 years the United States has occupied a prominent position in urging international action in this regard and in carrying out the international obligations it has assumed for the control of the traffic, and I trust that Congress will authorize an appropriation that will permit the Government to continue in the future as it has in the past.

I thank you for your letter and for this opportunity to express my views as to the need for further international activity in the work of suppressing the illicit traffic in narcotic drugs.

I am, my dear Mr. Porter,

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES E. HUGHES.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, the pending resolution authorizes an appropriation of \$40,000 to defray the expenses of the United States participation in the forthcoming conference to be held the latter part of this year. The conference will be called for the purpose of putting into practical effect the American construction of The Hague opium convention. That construction was placed on the convention by the last Congress. It is a construction that this Government has always advocated, and for the purpose of the Record I shall make a very brief statement.

I think it should be a source of gratification that in the Philippine Islands we very rarely, if ever, see the sunken eye, the emaciation, the pallor, and the nervousness, and in many instances the abscesses on the body from the use of the hypodermic syringe that are so common in certain oriental coun-

tries. We have proven by our action in the Philippines that the traffic in opium can be effectively suppressed and its use limited to strictly medicinal purposes. [Applause.]

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PORTER. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I notice that on page 2 of the resolution it says:

Whereas as the result of conferences in January, May, and September of 1923 between the representatives of the United States and governments represented by the League of Nations—

Mr. PORTER. Would the gentleman kindly defer his question until I am through? Then I shall be glad to answer it.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Very well.

Mr. PORTER. The act of March 4, 1909, prohibited any citizen of the United States from—

giving, selling, or otherwise supplying * * * any opium to any aboriginal native of any of the Pacific islands lying within the twentieth parallel of north latitude and the fortieth parallel of south latitude and the one hundred and twentieth meridian of longitude east of Greenwich and not being in possession of the protection of any civilized power. * * *

On July 24, 1906, Right Rev. Charles H. Brent, Bishop of the Philippines, wrote President Roosevelt suggesting that in view of the fact that from the earliest days of our diplomatic relations with the East the course of the United States of America has been so manifestly high in relation to the traffic in opium that it seemed to him almost our duty, now that we have the responsibility of actually handling the matter in our own possessions, to promote some movement that would gather in its embrace representatives from all countries, for the traffic in and use of opium is a matter of moment.

The preamble to the resolution, as stated by the Secretary of State, "shows so fully the background of the narcotic situation" that I shall content myself with a brief history of the attitude of the United States toward the illicit traffic in opium and its derivatives—morphia, heroin, and codeine; and the coca leaf and its derivative—cocaine; and the efforts made by our Government to suppress the abusive use of these habit-forming drugs.

The record shows that it has been the unbroken policy of the United States to insist on the limitation of the production of these drugs to the quantity required for strictly medicinal and scientific purposes. The treaties of 1844, 1858, 1880, and 1903 with China, the treaty of 1882 with Korea, and the treaty of 1858 with Japan prohibit American citizens from trafficking in opium or its derivatives with the citizens of those countries and fixed severe penalties for the violation of the treaties by any citizen of the United States, and provided further that—

the benefits of the most favored nation clause in existing treaties shall not be claimed by the subjects of either power as against the provisions of this article.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to continue for seven minutes more.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to proceed for seven minutes more. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, and I shall not, the gentleman has kindly promised me five minutes. Is he going to give me that five minutes?

Mr. PORTER. Certainly.

Mr. BLANTON. I shall expect to speak as much as five minutes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Reserving the right to object, with the same understanding, the gentleman said he would yield me ten minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. PORTER. By the act of Congress of March 3, 1905, it was provided that after March 1, 1908, it shall be unlawful to import into the Philippines opium in whatever form except by the Government and for strictly medicinal purposes only. The act of Congress of August 5, 1909, provided as follows:

Importation or shipment into the Philippines of the following articles is prohibited: * * * (g) Opium in whatever form except by the Government of the Philippines and pharmacists duly licensed and registered as such under the laws in force in said islands, and for strictly medicinal purposes only.

This legislation completely suppressed the traffic in opium and exploded the ages-old argument that the abusive use of

opium in the Orient was a necessary evil. I have here the figures of the imports of opium by the Philippine Islands from 1900 to 1903, prior to the passage of the acts of Congress:

	Pounds
In 1900 there were imported	224,115
In 1901 there were imported	369,037
In 1902 there were imported	137,583
In 1903 there were imported	254,547

and the figures showing imports of opium from 1918 to 1921 subsequent to the passage of the acts of Congress:

	Pounds
In 1918 the import was approximately	235
In 1919 the import was approximately	237
In 1920 the import was approximately	1,550
In 1921 the import was approximately	192
Total	2,214

In compliance with the request of Bishop Brent, President Roosevelt called a conference of the interested nations at Shanghai, China, which adopted certain resolutions looking toward the limitation of production of these drugs to the quantities needed for strictly medicinal purposes. In 1909 President Taft called a conference at The Hague for the purpose of conventionalizing the resolutions adopted at the Shanghai conference. The conference at The Hague met in the year 1912 and resulted in the existing Hague opium convention, which has been ratified by the overwhelming majority of all the nations of the world.

Two subsequent conferences were held at The Hague where much effective work was done but the war broke out and at its close the treaty of Versailles delegated to the League of Nations the duty or agency of executing The Hague opium convention on the part of the States signatory to the treaty of Versailles. On February 28 the Congress of the United States passed a resolution declaring in substance as follows:

1. If the purpose of The Hague opium convention is to be achieved according to its spirit and true intent, it must be recognized that the use of opium products for other than medicinal and scientific purposes is an abuse and not legitimate.

2. In order to prevent the abuse of these products it is necessary to exercise the control of the production of raw opium in such a manner that there will be no surplus available for nonmedical and nonscientific purposes.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for seven minutes more.

Mr. TILLMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, a great many of us are interested here in other matters on this long docket. There is no objection to this bill. It will be passed unanimously, as I understand. I do not like to object, but—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can extend his remarks in the Record.

Mr. TILLMAN. I thought the gentleman could restrict his request.

Mr. PORTER. I will ask for three minutes more.

Mr. TILLMAN. I will not object to that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. PORTER. In January, May, and September representatives of the United States attended conferences with the agency created by the other signatories to The Hague opium convention, and it was finally decided that the construction placed on the convention by the assembly of the league, namely, that production should be limited to the quantity required for legitimate purposes, was erroneous and that the American construction of said treaty, subject to a reservation, represented its true intent and purpose.

It was further decided that two international conferences should be called to meet in the latter part of the year 1924 to agree upon a plan to enforce the convention in accordance with the American construction and interpretation.

In view of the fact that the United States has succeeded in securing the acceptance of its construction of The Hague opium convention, subject to a reservation, and that a conference has been called to put into practical operation the American principles, it would, indeed, be most embarrassing if we failed to appropriate the funds necessary for such purpose.

The contest which the United States has waged against the abusive use of these drugs is one of which every American citizen has a right to feel proud, and I am firmly convinced that

we are on the last lap of a long journey toward the suppression of this great international sin.

It is hardly conceivable that civilized nations will longer allow the element of revenue to interfere with the suppression of this degrading traffic, which is a greater evil than human slavery. [Applause.]

Now I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LINTHICUM. On page 2 of the resolution I notice that there is this language:

Whereas as the result of conferences in January, May, and September of 1923, between the representatives of the United States and governments represented by the League of Nations, the latter governments agreed that the United States construction of The Hague opium convention, as provided in Public Resolution No. 96, Sixty-seventh Congress, approved March 2, 1923, represented the object which the treaty was intended to accomplish.

I want to ask the gentleman what was his position before the League of Nations, and what was the nature of the conference with the League of Nations?

Mr. BLANTON. That is a hard question.

Mr. PORTER. No; it is not a hard question.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended one minute, so as to allow him to answer the question.

Mr. BLANTON. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended two minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania be extended two minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it is indelicate to object, but on a calendar day like this it is equally indelicate to make the request. This calendar is composed of bills unobjected to, which are supposed to pass without debate. I hope the gentleman will be willing to conclude at the end of a minute.

Mr. PORTER. I could not answer that question in a minute. Two minutes would be the limit. I am very anxious to answer the question.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER. There is an amendment already pending. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PORTER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment on page 3, line 2. I move to strike out "\$40,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$10,000."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: Page 3, line 2 of the resolution, strike out "\$40,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$10,000."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. PORTER] is going, with four others, to Europe on this mission. I go with him in spirit, and I am for the things he stands for on this mission. But why on earth these five people should spend \$8,000 apiece is beyond my comprehension. I am willing to cut this \$40,000 down to \$10,000, and I hope my colleagues who are in favor of economy will support me. These four other individuals, led by our colleague here in the House, can easily make that trip on \$2,000 apiece, which would total \$10,000, and if they can not do it, they ought to stay at home. Conditions now are such that \$2,000 of American money in Europe will buy a whole lot of things, wet and dry, and I am sure these five excursionists can get along on \$10,000 in all.

That is my only purpose in now taking up the time of the House, and I hope that every man in the House who believes in economy will vote for my amendment. How on earth can these five individuals spend \$8,000 apiece—four men and one good woman?

The length of this resolution made me rather suspicious of it. It goes on to tell us what President Roosevelt did in 1907, and then what President Taft did in 1909, and then what President Wilson did in 1913, and then what the League of Nations has done. Why, the gentleman ought not to mention the League of Nations, because he and his Republican Party have not only ignored and disregarded it but turned it down. Now, he sets up in a resolution that it is the League of Nations that expects to carry out his Hague narcotic convention of

1912. If he is depending on the League of Nations he ought to cooperate with it a little more, instead of disregarding it and turning it down all the time.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. KING. Does not the gentleman think it is worth \$40,000 to us to recognize the League of Nations?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, it is such a small recognition after all that I doubt if it is worth it. We are only recognizing it on narcotics.

Mr. KING. It is recognized four times in the resolutions.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes. That is a kind of camouflage. It is going in by the back door. When I go into a place I do not go in by the back door. I go in openly by the front door.

Mr. MOREHEAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. MOREHEAD. This trip is what we call in the West a junketing trip?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes. I am willing to pay for the gentleman's trip. He accomplishes something every time he goes over there. I am behind him in what he is doing. This is his annual trip to Europe. He accomplishes something every time he goes; but I want to say this to him—and I am his friend—that he has got his kite up too high.

Forty thousand dollars is too much for five people to spend on this junketing trip that has much junketing in it. I hope the gentleman will agree to cut it down to \$10,000, because unless he does I am going to vote against so much waste.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of this resolution, having for its purpose the suppression of opium traffic and other narcotic drugs. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PORTER], chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, and his associates, Bishop Brent, Doctor Blue, and Mr. Neville, of the State Department, as a committee, accomplished a great work in their conference with the League of Nations.

It is wonderful indeed how we are gradually slipping into the League of Nations, and the conference of this committee with the league is but one of a number of steps which we have taken in that direction. I regret, however, that they could not have taken a part in the discussion like representatives from member nations before that great international body.

Mr. Fosdick, in speaking of my colleague, Mr. PORTER, said in the American Review of Reviews for April:

Our official representatives—that is, those appointed by Government agencies—are present only as "observers"—a shadowy term which in some cases has been conscientiously interpreted to debar them from speaking and voting. Mr. PORTER would not even stay in the room to hear the discussion of the measures for opium control; but, having presented his own ideas, solemnly led his delegation outside to avoid international entanglements.

[Applause.]

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINTHICUM. For a question.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. If the gentleman please, I never heard of this bill and I would like to have some information. I understand the gentleman to say that if we shall vote in favor of this bill it will be an expression on the part of the American Congress in behalf of the League of Nations.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Certainly it will. The gentleman's conference was with the League of Nations and the agreement was with the League of Nations.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. That is enough for me. Then I do not want to vote for it. [Applause.]

Mr. LINTHICUM. Well, if the gentleman is not in favor of the League of Nations and its operations he ought not to vote for this resolution. I notice that some dozen different representatives of the United States have gone to the League of Nations and placed their matters before it, and I think that if we propose to take part in the affairs of the world we ought to do it like other nations as a part of the League of Nations and not as a looker-on or as an observer, and that our representatives should not have to take the position which the gentleman from Pennsylvania was compelled to take.

I congratulate him on his work; he did splendid work, and \$40,000 is not too much to allow them to go back and to do more work. It is for two committees and may last several months.

One does not realize to what extent the United States has embarked upon consultations, conferences, and participations with the League of Nations without a thorough examination into the subject.

For a list of recent participations, I would call the attention of the House to the appointment by the Department of Agriculture of an official to the league's commission on anthrax. The appointment of General Blue, our then Surgeon General, to the opium committee, which was followed by the conference of the committee headed by Chairman PORTER, of which I have spoken; then later of Surgeon General Cummings, who represented America on the health committee of the league; and then of Assistant Surgeon General Blue, who represented the United States at the league's conference in London to consider antitoxic serum. In 1923, when Secretary Hughes informed the powers that the American relief organization, would retire from Greece, he sent a representative to the financial committee of the league, then to a special subcommittee of the council, where a plan for relief was consummated. In the same year our consul at Geneva, Mr. Haskell, and a special agent of the United States customs service, Mr. Van Dorem, represented the United States at the league's conference on customs formalities; and then we have the direct participation of Mr. Grew, the American minister to Switzerland, at the Geneva conference on the suppression of traffic in arms; and then there is the acceptance by John Bassett Moore of the league's court of international justice, and I might mention numerous other occasions where to all intents and purposes the United States participated in matters under discussion by the League of Nations without, however, any influence which membership therein might have brought us. I am indebted to the Baltimore Sun for the following editorial of to-day:

IS THIS ISOLATION?

To this country the most striking feature of the experts' report on reparations is not the carefully drawn clauses designed to enable Germany to resume payments. It is the very great extent to which active American participation is relied upon in order to make the plan workable.

It is useless to suppose that a huge block of German bonds can be sold in this country unless purchasers are assured that Germany will have a fair chance to recover economic security. That assurance is impossible unless our Government participates much more directly in the reparations settlement than has hitherto been the case. Nothing has been said in Washington to indicate a change from the policy of isolation. Yet the American chairman of the experts' commission is going ahead with plans for the German loan as though it is a matter of course that this country will take up a share of it.

But the share which is being allotted to America in clearing up the reparations problems only begins with the loan. An American, appointed as an American, is to be on the governing board of the proposed German bank of issue, sharing equal responsibility with the official representatives of allied and neutral nations.

An American is to be a member of the transfer committee of this bank, the duties of which will include not only handling the reparations account but also supervision of funds which the German Government might possibly use to finance measures of resistance. And while it is not specifically stated, it is broadly hinted that other Americans, acting as official appointees of the reparations commission, will be expected to serve as members of the commission to be appointed to supervise the imposition of taxation in Germany and to regulate inner financial reforms in that country.

Many in this country will feel that this proposed participation in the settlement of Europe's greatest problem is essential to our own welfare. Others will oppose it. But all will agree that the calm way in which American supervision of the reparations settlement is being worked out in Paris while the administration at Washington maintains its stand of rigid nonintervention is highly remarkable, to say the least.

It is incredible to suppose that General Dawes has written this report, involving this country in European affairs as deeply as if we were a full-fledged member of the League of Nations, without having first submitted his plans to Washington and received tacit approval thereof.

It is equally incredible to suppose that President Coolidge, who even side-steps American membership in the World Court, should have let General Dawes understand that he is at liberty to suggest our joining with Great Britain, France, Italy, and Belgium in a supervision of Germany to the extent proposed.

Yet the inference is inescapable that one of these incredible things has happened.

But meantime, while these steps toward the recovery of Europe are developing, no inkling comes from Washington that we have any but the most indirect interest in the work of the Dawes committee, regardless of the direct participation in European affairs it is evidently preparing to recommend for us.

Why should we continue to operate as an observer? If the United States intends to recognize the league, should we not

have courage and conviction sufficient to become a party to this great world league and enter by the front door, pay our just proportion of the expenses, and have a vote, as other nations now have? It is not correct when the gentleman from Pennsylvania says that only matters which were prescribed by treaty prior to the formation of the League of Nations have been considered by the United States with the league. Many of the matters which I have enumerated, and for which I am indebted not alone to the Baltimore Sun but to Mr. Fosdick, are new subjects which have originated long since the formation of the league.

I contend that the United States should have the position in world affairs to which we as a nation are entitled. I believe membership in the league would give us this position. If there are certain features of the league with which we are not pleased or which might be inimicable to our democratic form of government or to the liberties of the people, then let us eliminate those features and become a participant in world affairs. Through such participation we can help lead nations and the world back to normal conditions, and with our great resources not alone help to reestablish nations, but to secure world markets for our goods both from the farm and the factory.

We can not hope for that complete prosperity until our world customers are likewise prosperous. We can not hope for that influence in world affairs until we have established ourselves in that position which affords us world prominence. We can not hope for that great humanitarian idea for which America stands until we assume our responsibilities along with other nations. I sincerely will hail the day when America takes the position to which she is entitled before the world and assumes those responsibilities which come with those opportunities, to which this great Nation and people are entitled. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent to extend and revise his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, in regard to the amount of this appropriation, as I have said, we are on the last lap of a long journey with reference to the narcotic drug problem.

Two conferences are to be called. We are not certain whether we shall attend one or both of them. The matter is to be determined later. For instance, an emergency arose about a month ago and it was necessary to send two men to Paris to arrange for our part in the conferences. So far as salaries are concerned, there is no intention of paying salaries to the commissioners except in one instance, and it is not fair to talk about junketing. Bishop Brent, in 1902, led the warfare against opium in the Philippines. He represented our Government at Shanghai; he represented our Government three times at The Hague opium conventions, presiding over one of them, and he went across the Atlantic with me last summer twice and he never received a dollar of compensation, and he does not expect any. Mrs. Hamilton Wright is the widow of the man who represented us at Shanghai and again at The Hague. Mr. Neville is connected with our Consular Service.

You must remember this: This conference may last two or three months. Traveling expenses are high, subsistence is high, and, after all, the disbursement of this fund is left to the sound discretion of the Secretary of State under the terms of the resolution.

This is the crisis in the matter, and if it becomes necessary for the Secretary of State to hire an international lawyer of outstanding prominence or other assistants he ought to have the money with which to do it. In all probability the \$40,000 will not be expended.

Now, just a word in reply to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM]. The gentleman seems to forget that the United States has treaties with the countries now members of the League of Nations and that those treaties were made long before the League of Nations was ever thought of. That these nations had the right to form that association no one will question, but the fact they did form it does not deny us the right to assert our rights or discharge our obligations under the terms of these treaties. In every instance where the United States representatives have negotiated with the league it has been to assert a right or perform a duty under an existing treaty, and I confess frankly I can not see any distinction between negotiating with these nations en bloc and negotiating with them individually.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. OLIVER of New York. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I dislike at this time—

The SPEAKER. The Chair promised to recognize the gentleman from New York.

Mr. OLIVER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I will be very glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio, because I have great respect for anything he wants to submit to the House.

Mr. LONGWORTH. If the gentleman will yield, I was going to move to close debate. I entirely agree with my friend from Tennessee that days like this should not be taken up in debate. When unanimous consent has been given for the consideration of a bill, it is to be assumed that if unanimous consent is granted a long argument is not necessary. I speak only in the interests of protecting this calendar. I think the gentleman from Tennessee is absolutely right.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I hope, in view of the fact that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PORTER] has talked for 20 minutes, he will at least let the gentleman from New York [Mr. OLIVER] talk five minutes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I shall not submit the motion now, but I shall move to close debate after this.

Mr. OLIVER of New York. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I do not intend to prolong the debate unnecessarily. I was interested in objecting to the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] to reduce this appropriation to \$10,000. I have seen men ruined by opium, and if this committee that goes to Europe can save the life and career of but one person such as I have seen it will have justified the expenditure of the \$40,000. I think that the opium traffic is one of the most dangerous to the life and happiness of the American people. A great judge in New York, the chief city magistrate, Judge McAdoo, an ex-Member of Congress from New Jersey, one of the wisest advisers in our complex city life, wrote a marvelous article in World's Work in which he said that if the poppy fields of Turkey could be plowed up there would be thousands of lives and careers saved in the city of New York. He proved it in this remarkable article which he wrote. He has performed a great service to America.

I am interested in any mission that will break down the opium traffic of the world. I believe it is more vital to have this commission go unimpaired, fully equipped, and fully paid for than to have any other kind of expedition sent over to Europe. I believe the underworld is backed up by the dope peddler and that every criminal in this country is a part of the opium traffic of this country. I believe there is a direct connection between opium and crime. Crime causes this country the loss of hundreds of millions of dollars a year, and if we can spend \$40,000 to clip off but one criminal in his infancy, I tell you we will have justified the expense a thousandfold.

On behalf of humanity I ask that every dollar that this committee asks be appropriated, because it ought to carry with it the prayers of America and the prayers of all humankind, because if we can wipe out the opium traffic we can wipe out the most sinful, the most baneful, and the most malignant influence that is now wrecking and ruining the prospects of mankind. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of New York. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the gentleman have any idea that this committee can stop it?

Mr. OLIVER of New York. I certainly have, and I certainly hope they will stop it, and I will back it up with my vote and my voice anywhere any time. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order that no quorum is present. It is clear no quorum is present. The doorkeeper will close the doors, the sergeant at arms will bring in absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 13, nays 279, not voting 140, as follows:

YEAS—13

Blanton	Lowrey	Sanders, Tex.	Tillman
Hooker	Morehead	Stegall	
Lilly	Parks, Ark.	Taylor, Tenn.	
Logan	Reed, Ark.	Taylor, W. Va.	

NAYS—279

Abernethy	Faust	Leatherwood	Rogers, N. H.
Ackerman	Favrot	Leavitt	Ronjue
Aldrich	Fenn	Lee, Ga.	Rouse
Allen	Fish	Linthicum	Rubey
Allgood	Fisher	Lozier	Sanders, N. Y.
Almon	Fitzgerald	Luce	Sandlin
Andrew	Fleetwood	Lyon	Schafer
Arnold	Foster	McDuffie	Schall
Aswell	Free	McKeown	Schneider
Ayres	Freeman	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sears, Nebr.
Bacon	French	McLeod	Seger
Barbour	Frothingham	McReynolds	Shallenberger
Barkley	Fulbright	McSwain	Shreve
Beck	Fuller	McSweeney	Simmons
Beedy	Fulmer	MacGregor	Sinnott
Begg	Gallivan	MacLafferty	Sites
Bell	Gardner, Ind.	Madden	Smith
Bixler	Garner, Tex.	Magee, N. Y.	Smithwick
Black, Tex.	Garrett, Tenn.	Major, Ill.	Snell
Bland	Garrett, Tex.	Major, Mo.	Snyder
Bloom	Gasque	Manlove	Speaks
Boies	Gifford	Manfield	Stalker
Bowling	Glatfelter	Mapes	Stedman
Box	Greene, Mass.	Mead	Stengle
Boyce	Greenwood	Merritt	Stephens
Brand, Ohio	Griest	Michener	Stevenson
Briggs	Hadley	Miller, Wash.	Strong, Kans.
Browne, N. J.	Hammer	Milligan	Strong, Pa.
Browne, Wis.	Hardy	Mills	Summers, Wash.
Browning	Harrison	Minahan	Summers, Tex.
Buchanan	Hastings	Mooney	Swank
Buckley	Hawley	Moore, Ga.	Swing
Bulwinkle	Hayden	Moore, Ohio	Tague
Burtess	Hersey	Moore, Va.	Temple
Burton	Hickey	Moore, Ind.	Thatcher
Busby	Hill, Ala.	Morgan	Thomas, Ky.
Byrns, Tenn.	Hill, Md.	Morrow	Thomas, Okla.
Campbell	Hill, Wash.	Murphy	Thompson
Cannon	Hoch	Nelson, Me.	Timberlake
Carter	Howard, Nebr.	Newton, Mo.	Tincher
Casey	Howard, Okla.	Newton, Minn.	Tinkham
Chindblom	Huddleston	Nolan	Treadway
Clancy	Hudspeth	O'Connell, R. I.	Tucker
Clarke, N. Y.	Hull, Iowa	O'Connor, La.	Underhill
Cole, Iowa	Hull, William E.	O'Sullivan	Underwood
Cole, Ohio	Jacobstein	Oldfield	Upshaw
Collins	James	Oliver, Ala.	Vaile
Colton	Jeffers	Oliver, N. Y.	Vestal
Connery	Johnson, Ky.	Park, Ga.	Vincent, Mich.
Cook	Johnson, S. Dak.	Peavey	Vinson, Ga.
Cooper, Ohio	Johnson, Tex.	Petry	Vinson, Ky.
Cooper, Wis.	Johnson, Wash.	Perkins	Wainwright
Crisp	Johnson, W. Va.	Phillips	Watkins
Crosser	Jones	Porter	Watson
Crowther	Kelly	Pou	Weaver
Cummings	Kendall	Prall	White, Kans.
Dallinger	Ketcham	Purnell	Williams, Mich.
Darrow	Kincheloe	Quin	Williams, Tex.
Davey	King	Ragon	Williamson
Deal	Kopp	Rainey	Wilson, Ind.
Dickinson, Iowa	Kunz	Raker	Wilson, La.
Dickinson, Mo.	Kurtz	Ramseyer	Wilson, Miss.
Doughton	Kvale	Rankin	Winslow
Dowell	LaGuardia	Rayburn	Winter
Driver	Lampert	Reed, N. Y.	Wolff
Dyer	Lanham	Reld, Ill.	Wright
Evans, Iowa	Lankford	Richards	Wurzbach
Evans, Mont.	Larsen, Ga.	Roach	Yates
Fairchild	Larson, Minn.	Robinson, Iowa	Young
Fairfield	Lea, Calif.	Rogers, Mass.	

NOT VOTING—140

Anderson	Dominick	Langley	Rosenbloom
Anthony	Doyle	Lazaro	Sabath
Bacharach	Drane	Lehbach	Salmon
Bankhead	Drewry	Lindsay	Sanders, Ind.
Beers	Eagan	Lineberger	Scott
Berger	Edmonds	Little	Sears, Fla.
Black, N. Y.	Elliott	Longworth	Sherwood
Boylan	Frear	McClintic	Sinclair
Brand, Ga.	Fredericks	McFadden	Sprout, Ill.
Britten	Funk	McKenzie	Sprout, Kans.
Brumm	Garber	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Sullivan
Burdick	Geran	McNulty	Sweet
Butler	Gibson	Magee, Pa.	Swoope
Byrnes, S. C.	Gilbert	Martin	Taber
Cable	Goldsborough	Michaelson	Taylor, Colo.
Canfield	Graham, Ill.	Miller, Ill.	Tilson
Carew	Graham, Pa.	Montague	Tydings
Celler	Green, Iowa	Moore, Ill.	Vare
Christopherson	Griffin	Morin	Voigt
Clague	Haugen	Morris	Ward, N. C.
Clark, Fla.	Hawes	Mudd	Ward, N. Y.
Cleary	Holaday	Nelson, Wis.	Watson
Collier	Hudson	O'Brien	Watres
Connally, Tex.	Hull, Tenn.	O'Connell, N. Y.	Wefald
Connolly, Pa.	Hull, Morton D.	O'Connor, N. Y.	Weller
Corning	Humphreys	Paige	Welsh
Cramton	Jost	Parker	Wertz
Croll	Kahn	Patterson	White, Me.
Cullen	Kearns	Periman	Williams, Ill.
Curry	Keller	Quayle	Wingo
Davis, Minn.	Kent	Ransley	Wood
Davis, Tenn.	Kerr	Rathbone	Woodruff
Dempsey	Kiess	Reece	Woodrum
Denison	Kindred	Reed, W. Va.	Wyant
Dickstein	Knutson	Robison, Ky.	Zihlman

So the amendment was rejected.

The following additional pairs were announced:

Mr. Davis of Minnesota with Mr. Montague.
Mr. Frear with Mr. Bankhead.

Mr. Brumm with Mr. Drewry.
 Mr. Reece with Mr. Lazaro.
 Mr. Swoope with Mr. Tydings.
 Mr. Ward of New York with Mr. Wingo.
 Mr. Woodruff with Mr. Martin.
 Mr. Keller with Mr. Eagan.
 Mr. Lehlbach with Mr. Canfield.
 Mr. Elliott with Mr. Geran.
 Mr. Cable with Mr. Collier.
 Mr. Butler with Mr. Sabbath.
 Mr. White of Maine with Mr. McNulty.
 Mr. Curry with Mr. Kerr.
 Mr. Rosenbloom with Mr. Sherwood.
 Mr. Fredericks with Mr. Ward of North Carolina.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
 Mr. LILLY. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment.
 The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 2, after the word "exceed," strike out "\$40,000" and insert "\$20,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were 20 ayes and 167 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

DEFERRING PAYMENT OF RECLAMATION CHARGES

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 1631) to authorize the deferring of payments of reclamation charges.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. I ask that it be reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and empowered, in his discretion, to defer the dates of payments of any charges, rentals, and penalties which have heretofore accrued, or may hereafter accrue, prior to the 1st day of January, 1925, under the act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. L. p. 388), and amendatory and supplemental acts, and upon irrigation projects on Indian reservations, as may, in his judgment, be necessary to the making of rearrangements and readjustments in or concerning any irrigation project now existing under said act: *Provided, however,* That interest at the rate of 6 per cent per annum on the amount of each payment so deferred shall be collected in lieu of any penalties that may now be provided by law in case of delinquencies in such payments: *Provided further,* That no payment shall be deferred in any particular case beyond the date on which the last payment of construction charges shall be required by law to be made in that case, thereby permitting the distribution of the deferred payments over the life of existing contracts.

With the following committee amendments:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and empowered, in his discretion, to defer the dates of payments of any charges, rentals, and penalties which have heretofore accrued, or may hereafter accrue, prior to the 1st day of January, 1925, under the act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. L. p. 388), and amendatory and supplemental acts, as may, in his judgment, be necessary in or concerning any irrigation project now existing under said act: *Provided,* That no payment shall be deferred in any particular case beyond the date on which the last payment of construction charges shall be required by law to be made in that case, thereby permitting the distribution of the deferred payments over the life of existing contracts."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Idaho if an amendment has been agreed upon that will lengthen the time of this extension?

Mr. SMITH. Yes; I intend to offer it as a committee amendment.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman be good enough to have it read now?

Mr. SMITH. Yes; I will offer it now.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. SMITH: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and empowered, in his discretion, to defer the dates of payments of any charges, rentals, and penalties which have accrued prior to the 1st day of March, 1924, under the act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. L. p. 388), and amendatory and supplemental acts, as may, in his judgment, be necessary in or concerning any irrigation project now existing under

said act: *Provided,* That no payment shall be deferred under this section in any particular case beyond March 1, 1927: *Provided,* That upon such adjustment being made, any penalties or interest which may have accrued in connection with such unpaid construction and operation and maintenance charges shall be canceled, and in lieu thereof the amount so due, and the payment of which is hereby extended, shall draw interest at the rate of 5 per cent per annum, paid annually from the time said amount became due to date of payment: *And provided further,* That in case the principal and interest herein provided for are not paid in the manner and at the time provided by this section, any penalty now provided by law shall thereupon attach from the date of such default.

"Sec. 2. That where an individual water user or individual applicant for a water right under a Federal irrigation project constructed or being constructed under the act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. L. p. 388) or any act amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto makes application prior to January 1, 1925, alleging that he will be unable to make the payments as required in section 1 hereof, excepting operation and maintenance charges for drainage on the Boise, Idaho, project for the year 1922, or prior thereto, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized in his discretion prior to March 1, 1925, to add such accrued and unpaid charges to the construction charge of the land of such water user or applicant, and to distribute such accumulated charges equally over each of the subsequent years, beginning with the year 1925, or, in the discretion of the Secretary, distribute a total of one-fourth over the first half of the remaining years of the 20-year period beginning with the year 1925, and three-fourths over the second half of such period, so as to complete the payment during the remaining years of the 20-year period of payment of the original construction charge: *Provided,* That upon such adjustment being made any penalties or interest which may have accrued in connection with such unpaid construction and operation and maintenance charges shall be canceled, and in lieu thereof the amount so due, and the payment of which is hereby extended, shall draw interest at the rate of 5 per cent per annum, paid annually from the time said amount became due to date of payment: *Provided further,* That the applicant for the extension shall first show to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Interior detailed statement of his assets and liabilities and probable inability to make payment at the time required in section 1: *And provided further,* That in case the principal and interest herein provided for are not paid in the manner and at the time provided by this act any penalty now provided by law shall thereupon attach from the date of such default: *And provided further,* That similar relief in whole or in part may be extended by the Secretary of the Interior to a legally organized group of water users of a project upon presentation of a sufficient number of individual showings made in accordance with the foregoing proviso to satisfy the Secretary of the Interior that such extension is necessary."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I want to reserve the right to object until the gentleman can explain the amendment. I followed the reading as closely as I could, but the confusion was such that I do not fully understand it. I reserve the right to object and ask the gentleman to explain the effect of the amendment.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, the amendment agreed upon by the committee at the last meeting provides—

Mr. BEGG. Before the gentleman begins will he permit a suggestion?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. This is the third time this extension has been made. If permitted this time, will the gentleman in his statement give us some assurance that this will be the last?

Mr. SMITH. If the gentleman can assure us that the farmers will be able to sell their crops at a profit next year I can, otherwise not.

Mr. BEGG. That is no answer at all. Not all the farmers in the United States are asking for the Government to give extension on their obligations, and very few get it.

Mr. SMITH. I am talking about the farmers on the reclamation projects where they have high overhead expenses of \$10 to \$20 an acre, which does not apply to other agricultural sections.

Mr. SINNOTT. If the gentleman will yield; this will be the last extension on these particular charges.

Mr. SMITH. Yes; because they are expected to be paid in three years.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH. I will.

Mr. RAKER. The House did not get the statement that the gentleman made—that this amendment was presented to the committee having charge of the matter, and they heard from the department and offered this amendment to meet the situation, which conforms to the desire of the department and the Reclamation Service.

Mr. SMITH. That is true. The committee carefully considered the amendment, the enactment of which is urged by the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Reclamation to save delay. The bill as passed the Senate provided an interest charge of 6 per cent. As the committee first reported it we thought no interest should be charged on the deferred payments. On further consideration of the matter, and taking the advice of some older members who objected to this feature of the bill, we agreed to the amendment which has been read at the desk, which provides for interest at 5 per cent. It also provided that the charges that have accrued during the last year may be paid within three years, and prior to the 1st of next January if the farmer concludes that he can not pay these back charges within three years, then under section 2 they are to be scattered out over the balance of the contract term, one quarter of which may be paid in the first half and three quarters in the second half. The bill is similar to the existing law and is intended to meet the necessities confronting water users who are delinquent—the farmers who are unable to pay the water charges due the 1st of last December—and in order to give the Secretary of the Interior legal authority to turn on the water for the opening of the irrigation season we have presented the pending bill.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. HUDSPETH. There seems to be a misunderstanding or not a full understanding about this bill. Some Members seem to think that it does not provide for interest. I understand that the amendment does provide interest.

Mr. SMITH. It provides interest on delinquent construction charges and maintenance and operation charges.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Carried over a certain period. The charges are not canceled.

Mr. SMITH. No; they are not canceled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I offer the amendment which has been reported by the Clerk.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. SMITH].

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The SPEAKER. By unanimous consent, House Resolution 223, a resolution providing for the consideration of this bill, will be laid on the table.

There was no objection.

BRIDGE ACROSS PEARL RIVER, MISS.

The next business was the bill (H. R. 6903) granting the consent of Congress to the Board of Supervisors of Leake County, Miss., to construct a bridge across the Pearl River in the State of Mississippi.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 2436, a bill of identical language already passed by the Senate, be substituted for the House bill?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to substitute an identical Senate bill for the House bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Board of Supervisors of Leake County, Miss., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Pearl River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Grigsby's Ferry, Leake County, State of Mississippi, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

By unanimous consent, the similar House bill, H. R. 6903, was ordered to lie on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS PEARL RIVER, MISS.

The next business was the bill (H. R. 6902) granting the consent of Congress to the Board of Supervisors of Leake County, Miss., to construct a bridge across the Pearl River, in the State of Mississippi.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is not an error by any chance granting an authorization for the construction of the same bridge?

Mr. COLLINS. No.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 2437, passed by the Senate, in identical language, be substituted for the House bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to substitute an identical Senate bill for the House bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Board of Supervisors of Leake County, Miss., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Pearl River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Battle Bluff Crossing, Leake County, State of Mississippi, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

By unanimous consent a similar House bill, H. R. 6902, was laid on the table.

FEES FOR REGISTERED-MAIL MATTER

The next business was the bill (H. R. 6352) to authorize the Postmaster General to fix the fees chargeable for registration of mail matter, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. I object.

Mr. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, this is the second time this bill has been up, and as I understand it three objectors are required.

Mr. MOREHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. LILLY. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Three gentlemen have objected, and the Clerk will report the next bill.

BRIDGE ACROSS SUSQUEHANNA RIVER, PA.

The next business was the bill (H. R. 6810) granting the consent of Congress to the Millersburg & Liverpool Bridge Corporation, and its successors, to construct a bridge across the Susquehanna River at Millersburg, Pa.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Millersburg & Liverpool Bridge Corporation, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Pennsylvania, and its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Susquehanna River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Millersburg, Pa., in the county of Dauphin, in the State of Pennsylvania, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE INDIAN AFFAIRS, OKLAHOMA

The next business was House Joint Resolution 181, creating a joint committee of three Members of the Senate and three

Members of the House to investigate the administration of Indian affairs in the State of Oklahoma.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House joint resolution?

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. BRAND of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Three gentlemen have objected.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I think the objection which the gentleman from Ohio made to this resolution when it was up last can be cured.

Mr. BEGG. Oh, we have wasted a lot of time this afternoon, and we have already passed a bill that I think makes the passage of this resolution unnecessary. I do not see any reason to waste any more time. I shall object.

Mr. CARTER. The bill about which the gentleman talks which we passed does not apply to these matters. It applies only to the Osage Nation. The gentleman's objection was that this was a joint resolution. He would not object, as I understand it, to a House resolution authorizing the Committee on Indian Affairs—

Mr. BEGG. If the gentleman will have the committee bring in such a resolution, we will consider that.

USE OF LANDS IN QUINAIELT INDIAN RESERVATION FOR LIGHTHOUSE PURPOSES

The next business was the bill (H. R. 5416) to authorize setting aside of certain tribal lands within the Quinalt Indian Reservation, in Washington, for lighthouse purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to set aside for lighthouse purposes lot 5 in section 13 and lot 1 section 24, township 21 north, range 13 west of Willamette meridian, within the Quinalt Indian Reservation, in Washington, containing a total of 43.20 acres: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Commerce shall pay the Indians therefor, from the appropriation for the general expenses of the Lighthouse Service for the fiscal year in which this reservation is made, such price for the lands set aside hereunder as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce: *Provided further*, That the funds thus derived shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of the Quinalt Indian Reservation and shall be subject to expenditure for their benefit in such manner as the Secretary of the Interior may deem for their best interests.

SEC. 2. That there is hereby reserved for the use and benefit of the Indians of the Quinalt Indian Reservation in common all oil, gas, coal, or other minerals in the lands set aside hereunder for lighthouse purposes and the right to prospect for and mine these commodities under such rules and regulations as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE OF AGRICULTURE

The SPEAKER. The next on the Consent Calendar is S. J. Res. 96, which has been provided for in the appropriation bill and without objection will be laid on the table.

There was no objection.

TUITION OF INDIAN CHILDREN IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

The next bill on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 4835) to pay tuition of Indian children in public schools.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with an agreement made with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] the last time the bill was under consideration, I desire to offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is the amendment in place of the whole bill?

Mr. LEAVITT. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the amendment will be reported instead of the bill. [After a pause.] The Chair hears no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to pay any claims which are ascertained to be proper and just, whether covered by contracts or not, for tuition of Indian pupils in State public schools during the fiscal years 1922 and 1923, and to expend for such purpose out of balances remaining from the appropriations for support of Indian day and industrial schools for such fiscal years not to exceed a total of \$30,000, without regard to the limitations heretofore placed by law upon the use of such appropriations for tuition of Indian pupils in public schools."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

AUTHORIZING THE COURT OF CLAIMS TO ADJUDICATE CLAIMS OF CREEK INDIANS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 7913) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and enter judgment in any claims which the Creek Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction be, and is hereby, conferred upon the Court of Claims, notwithstanding the lapse of time or statutes of limitation, to hear, examine, and adjudicate and render judgment in any and all legal and equitable claims arising under or growing out of any treaty or agreement between the United States and the Creek Indian Nation or Tribe, or arising under or growing out of any act of Congress in relation to Indian affairs, which said Creek Nation or Tribe may have against the United States, which claims have not heretofore been determined and adjudicated on their merits by the Court of Claims or the Supreme Court of the United States: *Provided, however*, That the provisions of this act shall not be construed to confer jurisdiction upon the court to hear, examine, consider, and adjudicate any balance claimed to be due on the so-called loyal Creek claim, or any amount claimed to be due to equalize allotments among members of the Creek Tribe.

SEC. 2. Any and all claims against the United States within the purview of this act shall be forever barred unless suit be instituted or petition filed as herein provided in the Court of Claims within five years from the date of approval of this act, and such suit shall make the Creek Nation party plaintiff and the United States party defendant. The petition shall be verified by the attorney or attorneys employed to prosecute such claim or claims under contract with the Creeks approved by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the Secretary of the Interior; and said contract shall be executed in their behalf by a committee chosen by them under the direction and approval of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the Secretary of the Interior. Official letters, papers, documents, and records, or certified copies thereof may be used in evidence, and the departments of the Government shall give access to the attorney or attorneys of said Indian nation to such treaties, papers, correspondence, or records as may be needed by the attorney or attorneys of said Indian nation.

SEC. 3. In said suit the court shall also hear, examine, consider, and adjudicate any claims which the United States may have against said Indian nation, but any payment which may have been made by the United States upon any claim against the United States shall not operate as an estoppel, but may be pleaded as an offset in such suit.

SEC. 4. That from the decision of the Court of Claims in any suit prosecuted under the authority of this act, an appeal may be taken by either party as in other cases to the Supreme Court of the United States.

SEC. 5. That upon the final determination of any suit instituted under this act, the Court of Claims shall decree such amount or amounts as it may find reasonable to be paid the attorney or attorneys so employed by said Indian nation for the services and expenses of said attorneys rendered or incurred prior or subsequent to the date of approval of this act: *Provided*, That in no case shall the aggregate amounts decreed by said Court of Claims for fees be in excess of the amount or amounts stipulated in the contract of employment, or in excess of a sum equal to 10 per cent of the amount of recovery against the United States.

SEC. 6. The Court of Claims shall have full authority by proper orders and process to bring in and make parties to such suit any or all persons deemed by it necessary or proper to the final determination of the matters in controversy.

SEC. 7. A copy of this petition shall, in such case, be served upon the Attorney General of the United States, and he, or some attorney from the Department of Justice to be designated by him, is hereby directed to appear and defend the interests of the United States in such case.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, on page 2, line 13, I offer an amendment. Strike out the word "five" and insert "three."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 13, strike out the word "five" and insert in lieu thereof the word "three."

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, all I want to say in reference to this is very brief. If you leave that five years, you will continue the employment of attorneys perhaps unnecessarily long. Now, I should think—and perhaps the gentleman from Oklahoma can correct my impression—but I should think that all the claims that could be filed, or are likely to be filed, might be done within a period of three years. In other words, I should think nobody will be jeopardized by making it three years, and these Indians' money will certainly be saved from the employment of unnecessary attorneys.

Mr. HASTINGS. If the gentleman will yield, the only objection to that is that there are five of these civilized tribes. This is the last one in this bill. The others have been passed, and we followed exactly the language, in so far as the limitation is concerned, of the other four bills. We passed one for the Cherokees which was signed by the President, which was five years; we passed one for the Seminoles, one for the Choctaws and Chickasaws, and this is the last of these five tribes.

Mr. BEGG. Does the gentleman really think—

Mr. HASTINGS. They will be emancipated, their affairs are now being wound up, and will be wound up within five years, so that no jurisdictional act should ever be passed for either of these Five Civilized Tribes after this is over. This winds it up completely, and—

Mr. BEGG. The gentleman thinks three years would not be long enough?

Mr. HASTINGS. That is my judgment, and that is the reason we put in five years.

Mr. CARTER. There is no reason why this tribe should be dealt with differently from the other Five Civilized Tribes.

Mr. BEGG. I will say I will withdraw the amendment in order to gain time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman withdraws the amendment.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN LANDS FROM ROCKY MOUNTAIN NATIONAL PARK TO COLORADO NATIONAL FOREST

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 2713) to transfer certain lands of the United States from the Rocky Mountain National Park to the Colorado National Forest, Colo.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is a national park, my attention was distracted at the moment. I think we should have some one explain especially the necessity of taking this amount out of a national park and putting it in this reserve. I will just reserve the right to object if any gentleman wants to make a statement.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Mr. Speaker, replying to the suggestion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] that there should be shown the necessity for this legislation, I desire to say that a farmers' irrigation company desires a portion of land which is partially in the national park and partially in the national forest, in order to construct a reservoir for irrigation purposes.

Now, to show the membership of the House just how little the park is affected by this proposed legislation, here on this map before you [indicating] is the Colorado National Forest, and here is the Colorado National Park. This [indicating] is the dividing line between them; and having been the author of the bill for the extension of this park, I know just exactly how this line was formed.

The park service desired for purposes of administration that it be on the peak of the mountain, dividing the slopes of the mountain, so that the administration of it could be easily looked after, and they changed the description I had used for metes and bounds and made the boundary line along the crest of this mountain range, and in the survey for the location of the reservoir, which the Geological Survey has shown in the hearings to be the only available place for the reservoir, they say there are 345 acres within the national park. This bill only provides for the elimination of that many acres out of the national park and transfer into the forest reservation, which department is permitted under the law to grant permits for this and other purposes, which is not the case with the Interior Department or the park service. This bill has the approval of both the Department of Agriculture and the In-

terior Department, and as you will observe by the hearings is favored by the park service as evidenced by the statement made by Mr. Cameron before the Public Lands Committee.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the reservation.

The SPEAKER. The reservation is withdrawn. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That those portions of the following-described tracts now within the Rocky Mountain National Park be, and are hereby, transferred to the Colorado National Forest and shall hereafter be subject to all laws relating to the use and administration of the national forests: Section 10; northwest quarter of southeast quarter, southwest quarter of the northeast quarter, and the southwest quarter of section 11; northwest quarter of the northeast quarter, north half of the northwest quarter, and the southwest quarter of the northwest quarter of section 15; and the northeast quarter of section 16; township 6 north, range 75 west, sixth principal meridian.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 387) to prescribe the method of capital punishment in the District of Columbia.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. BEGG. I think that is entirely too important a bill to be passed in this way, and therefore I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard. The Clerk will report the next bill.

CLAIM OF RHODE ISLAND FOR EXPENDITURES IN WAR WITH SPAIN

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 913) referring the claim of the State of Rhode Island for expenses during the war with Spain to the Court of Claims for adjudication.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. BEGG. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made. The Clerk will report the next bill.

WIDENING GEORGIA AVENUE

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 1339) to authorize the widening of Georgia Avenue between Fairmont Street and Gresham Place NW.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That under and in accordance with the provisions of subchapter 1 of chapter 15 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia, within six months after the passage of this act, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, authorized and directed to institute in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia a proceeding in rem to condemn the land that may be necessary for widening of Georgia Avenue between Fairmont Street and Gresham Place NW., with a width of not less than 90 feet, in accordance with maps on file in the office of the surveyor of the District of Columbia: *Provided, however,* That the entire amount found to be due and awarded by the jury in said proceedings as damages for, and in respect of, the land to be condemned for said widening, plus the costs and expenses of the proceedings hereunder, shall be assessed by the jury as benefits against the property which the jury shall find to be benefited.

Sec. 2. That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of the revenues of the District of Columbia, an amount sufficient to pay the necessary costs and expenses of the condemnation proceeding taken pursuant hereto, and for the payment of the amounts awarded as damages to be repaid to the District of Columbia from the assessments for benefits, and covered into the Treasury to the credit of the revenues of the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

CONVICT LABOR

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the resolution (H. Res. 176) directing the Secretary of Labor to make a report on the subject of convict labor in the United States.

The title of the resolution was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this resolution?

Mr. BLANTON. I object.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

PAYMENT TO CERTAIN RED LAKE INDIANS IN MINNESOTA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 4460) authorizing payment to certain Red Lake Indians, out of Chippewa Indian funds, for garden plats, surrendered for school-farm use.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to withdraw from the Treasury of the United States not to exceed \$1,000, out of moneys on deposit to the credit of the Red Lake Indians in Minnesota, and to use the same, or as much thereof as may be necessary, in reimbursing certain Red Lake Indians whom he may find to have suffered loss through the taking of their individual garden plats, without remuneration to them, for Indian school-farm purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the title will be amended to conform to the text.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

PAYMENT TO RED LAKE BAND OF CHIPPEWA INDIANS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 25) authorizing a per capita payment of \$50 each to the members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. BLANTON. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made. The Clerk will report the next bill.

QUIETING TITLES TO LAND IN FLOMATON, ALA.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 4437) to quiet titles to land in the municipality of Flomaton, State of Alabama.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. JEFFERS. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made. The Clerk will report the next bill.

WIDENING HAINES STREET, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 4981) to authorize the Secretary of War to grant permission to the city of Philadelphia, Pa., to widen Haines Street in front of the National Cemetery, Philadelphia, Pa.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DARROW] what is the Government getting out of this bill?

Mr. DARROW. I will say to the gentleman that this is a very needed improvement. The Government is giving up no rights, but merely permits the city of Philadelphia to widen the street from 33 feet to 50 feet, so the city will have an opportunity to construct sidewalks in front of the cemetery. All of the expense is to be borne by the city, and the Government has already, I am informed, built a fence back of the old wall, so that there will be no change at all.

Mr. BLANTON. Will it require the disinterring of any bodies in the cemetery?

Mr. DARROW. No. The nearest body to the line is about 193 feet back from the 84-foot line.

Mr. BLANTON. This line extends how long?

Mr. DARROW. I think it is 970 feet in length.

Mr. BLANTON. Has this bill been approved by the War Department?

Mr. DARROW. It has been approved by the War Department twice.

Mr. BLANTON. There is no objection by the War Department?

Mr. DARROW. The Secretary of War thinks it is a very needed improvement and there is quite a lengthy letter from the Secretary printed in the report. The street has gotten to be a thoroughfare greatly used by automobiles, and all the foot passengers have to walk in the bed of the roadway, so that it is very dangerous.

Mr. BLANTON. I shall not object, because I believe it is necessary that the gentleman, who is a member of the steering committee, pass some bill to offset his not carrying out the farmers' request as to raises in salaries.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, my colleague, Mr. CRAMTON, wanted me to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania whether he would accept this amendment: At the end of the paragraph insert "and erect an iron fence on the new street line along the frontage of the said property"?

Mr. DARROW. I understand the iron fence has already been constructed by the War Department, is in place, and paid for.

Mr. BEGG. Back where it belongs?

Mr. DARROW. Back where it belongs—84 feet back from the present wall.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and empowered, in his discretion, to permit the city of Philadelphia, Pa., to use and occupy for street purposes all or any part of a strip of land, 8 feet 6 inches in width, off the south side of the Philadelphia National Cemetery, in said city, and along the Haines Street frontage of said cemetery: *Provided,* That the said city shall remove the present stone wall marking the boundary line between said cemetery and said street and grade, build, and maintain a sidewalk and curb along the frontage of said cemetery and care for and maintain said street the same as other public streets of said city.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

UNITED STATES VETERANS' BUREAU

Mr. LOZIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the independent offices appropriation bill and also on the Veterans' Bureau paragraph.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to extend and revise his remarks in the RECORD for the purpose indicated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LOZIER. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, the paragraph in the pending bill relating to the United States Veterans' Bureau carries an appropriation of \$79,095,773 less than that carried in the 1924 appropriation bill for the Veterans' Bureau. This reduction is in the following items: Salaries and expense, \$3,194,063; printing and binding, \$25,000; military and naval compensation, \$35,450,000; medical and hospital service, \$6,683,710; vocational rehabilitation, \$31,743,000; military and naval insurance, \$2,000,000. The appropriation carried in the pending bill for the United States Veterans' Bureau is the exact amount estimated and recommended by the Budget. It, of course, should be understood that this appropriation is for the fiscal year of 1925. It was estimated by the Appropriations Committee that conditions will now justify a reduction of 4,500 in the number of employees for 1925, which means an annual saving of \$5,629,778. During the year 1924 there was a reduction of 3,246 in the total number of employees.

It will be observed that the work in this department is becoming less and less each year, and it is expected that this rate of decrease in the number of the office personnel will continue for some time. While every good citizen desires that the bureau shall have all necessary office and clerical help, no one wants us to maintain a larger office personnel than is reasonably necessary for the efficient and expeditious conduct of the bureau. So we are glad that the salary and office expense account can be reduced over \$3,000,000 without impairing the efficiency of the bureau. An additional saving of \$25,000 in the printing expense is, of course, worth while.

The largest reduction is in the item "military and naval compensation," \$35,450,000. This does not mean that less money will be expended this year for military and naval compensation than last, but it is unnecessary to make the appropriation so large this year because there is an unexpended balance remaining over from last year of approximately \$43,000,000. So the amount available for military and naval compensation in 1925 will be entirely adequate, and there will be an unexpended balance from the 1925 appropriation which will in like manner reduce the appropriation for 1926. Of course, no one desires to withhold from the service men any just compensation to which they may be entitled, and I am quite sure that the present appropriation for this purpose, with the amount left over from the current year, will be entirely adequate to meet every demand.

For medical and hospital service, the appropriation for 1925 is \$6,683,710 less than for the fiscal year 1924. This amount is the same as the Budget estimated for the year 1925. With \$2,000,000 left over from the current fiscal year, the committee was unanimously of the opinion that the proposed appropriation would be entirely adequate to meet every demand incident to the medical and hospital service. Inasmuch as the subcommittee has gone thoroughly into this question, I am willing to accept the recommendation of the committee, but in so doing I want it distinctly understood that I do not favor any policy that will deprive the disabled ex-service men of any care or attention to which they are entitled under a liberal and just construction of our laws.

I am not willing to economize at the expense of the comfort of the men who suffered and sacrificed to preserve our Government and to perpetuate the ideals for which it stands. May I say in this connection that, while I am convinced General Hines is honestly and sincerely endeavoring to administer the affairs of the Veterans' Bureau in a just and proper manner, I nevertheless believe that certain reforms and new regulations should be introduced in the administration of the bureau. While I do not want to offer any unjust or undeserved criticism against the present management of the bureau, I think it is quite evident that some of the department heads and subordinate officers have promulgated and are enforcing rules and regulations not justified by law and not in harmony with the letter and spirit of the act making provision for treatment and compensation of disabled service men. In other words, I believe that in many instances the regulations are so strict that they defeat the spirit and purpose of the law. It would seem in many instances that the rules are so rigid that every doubt is resolved against the ex-service man and the entire burden of proof is placed on him to establish affirmatively and by convincing and conclusive evidence, and may I say beyond a reasonable doubt, that the disability is of service origin. In many instances those rules are unnecessarily harsh and frequently indefensible. Quantum of proof should not be so great as to render it impossible for the soldier to meet the requirements of the bureau, where, as in many cases, there is great difficulty in establishing affirmatively that the disability is of service origin. There should be a fair, just, and liberal construction of the law to the end that its benevolent purposes and provisions may not be sacrificed on the sharp edge of technicality. I therefore urge on the bureau a policy of more liberal construction of the law and less rigidity in the application of its bureau-made rules.

Much has been said in debate as to the management of the Veterans' Bureau hospitals. In this connection I will say that I am convinced that at all times the appropriations have been ample and sufficient to conduct these hospitals efficiently and properly and afford to the inmates an abundance of wholesome food and all necessary comfort and treatment. If the inmates of any of these hospitals have not received proper care and attention, it is because of inefficient management of those in charge of the local institutions and in such cases there should be an immediate removal of the officers and managers responsible for these conditions. I am hoping that as a result of full publicity every inefficient manager in charge of these hospitals may be speedily discharged and their places filled with capable men who will efficiently manage the institutions, give the inmates an abundant supply of wholesome food and otherwise provide for their care and comfort in harmony with the law under which these institutions are being maintained. No man with a "political pull" should be appointed manager or have the control of one of these hospitals. I think Congress should clearly indicate to the Director of the Veterans' Bureau that these hospitals must be properly maintained, and that the inmates must receive the care and attention to which they are entitled and for which adequate provision has been made by Congress.

While the appropriation for 1925 for vocational rehabilitation is \$31,743,000 less than for the current year, this decrease is justified because the proposed appropriation of \$89,000,000 will be adequate to meet every need during the fiscal year of 1925. Much of the vocational instruction has been completed, and one by one the schools are closing and the men have been rapidly going out of training and into employment. This, of course, is to be expected and it is but natural that the vocational training item should decrease from year to year and the decrease from now on should be very rapid. But, of course, ample funds have been and will be provided to insure vocational training in accordance with the letter and spirit of the law.

The appropriation of \$88,000,000 for military and naval insurance is \$2,000,000 less than the appropriation for 1924. This sum will be sufficient to meet all death and disability claims. In this connection may I state that of 4,500,000 policies in force during the war the number has now dropped to approximately 600,000. Of these policies 216,123 provide for what is known as "term insurance," the insurance provided thereby being \$1,873,692,905, while 338,781 are "converted insurance" policies, calling for \$1,304,909,995.55 insurance. The "converted insurance" policies are of different forms, namely, ordinary life, 20-payment life, 30-payment life, 20-year endowment, 30-year endowment, and endowment at the age of 62. Of course, it is unfortunate that so many ex-service men allowed their insurance policies to lapse.

In making the appropriations we are reminded of the fact that while the war is over a very large part of the cost of the war remains unpaid, and this Nation will for years stagger under the economic load and financial burden which inevitably come as a result of the World War. There is no way by which this financial burden can be avoided. Although the war is over, the war debt remains and must be paid. It is, therefore, of vital importance that strict economy be observed in the conduct of government, local, State, and national, to the end that while we are properly taking care of our ex-service men and discharging our every duty to them, we may at the same time reduce as rapidly as possible our national debt and the burden of taxation.

SALE OF LANDS AT THE HEAD OF CORDOVA BAY, ALASKA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 2811) to amend section 7 of the act of February 6, 1909, entitled "An act authorizing the sale of lands at the head of Cordova Bay, in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, I think the gentleman ought to make a report on this bill before it is passed by unanimous consent.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. The only change sought to be made in the act of February 6, 1909, is to strike out the words "two years from the approval of the plan mentioned in the preceding section" and insert in lieu thereof the words, "one year from the receipt of written notice from the Secretary of the Interior." Under the terms of the act and patent issued to Donald A. McKenzie he was required to build a pier at Cordova Bay within two years after the plotting and approval of the town site or forfeit all his rights thereunder. Extensions have been granted from time to time for the construction of the piers but the Secretary of the Interior feels that these extensions can not be granted indefinitely. Under the act as amended construction of the pier is deferred until such time as the Secretary shall see fit to require construction.

In other words, I might say to the gentleman that the only purpose of the bill is to amend the act in such a manner that the construction of this particular pier, as provided in the act of February 6, 1909, will not be required until the Secretary of the Interior shall serve notice upon the owners of the town site to proceed with such construction. The fact is that there is no railroad now extending to this town site of Nelson and there are no improvements upon the premises of any kind. If the pier were constructed now it would probably rot or wash away before it could be used for any purpose. The object of the amendment is to protect the equity of the present owner of the town site. She is now an employee of the Interior Department in this city and should not be put to the useless expense of building a wharf. So we are seeking to amend the law in such a manner that she will not have to construct this pier until she receives notice from the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. BLANTON. This is for the benefit of one individual?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. It is for the benefit of Mrs. Donald A. McKenzie, who is now working in the Department of the In-

terior. Her husband sunk his entire fortune in the development of Alaska and died, leaving his widow practically nothing except the 2,000 acres which constitutes this town site.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the Secretary of the Interior approve this bill?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Yes; he has approved it. An identical bill which I introduced in the Sixty-seventh Congress was also approved by the department.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 7 of the act of February 6, 1909, entitled "An act authorizing the sale of lands at the head of Cordova Bay, in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes," be amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 7. That the corporation named in section 1 of this act, or its assigns, shall, within six months from the approval of the plan mentioned in the preceding section, pay to the proper receiver the full purchase price of the lands applied for; and within five years after the issuance of patent said corporation shall do all things necessary to render 320 acres of the land purchased suitable and available for wharfage and town-site purposes in accordance with the plan thereof submitted as required in section 6 of this act, and shall within one year from the receipt of written notice from the Secretary of the Interior construct within said wharfage and dock area a public dock, wharf, or pier, with suitable approaches on the land side and with not less than 34 feet of water at mean low tide leading to and surrounding the same, so as to enable ocean steamers to approach, dock, discharge, and take on cargoes thereat; that patent for said lands shall recite that they are issued under the provisions of this act and are subject to cancellation and the land therein granted to forfeiture as herein provided; and if said corporation or its assigns shall fail to comply with any of the terms and conditions of this act, either before or after the issuance of patent, all interests, rights, or title which may have accrued or vested under this act shall be forfeited to the United States, and the application under which they accrued, or the patent under which they vested, shall be canceled: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior may, on satisfactory showing, reasonably extend the time within which any of the acts enumerated in this act may be performed."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

APPROPRIATION TO INDEMNIFY DAMAGES CAUSED BY SEARCH FOR BODY OF ADMIRAL JOHN PAUL JONES

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 2392) authorizing an appropriation to indemnify damages caused by the search for the body of Admiral John Paul Jones.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. I object.

LOAN OF CERTAIN TENTS, ETC., TO THE UNITED CONFEDERATE VETERANS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 163) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan certain tents, cots, chairs, etc., to the executive committee of the United Confederate Veterans for use at the thirty-fourth annual reunion to be held at Memphis, Tenn., in June, 1924.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and is hereby, authorized to loan, at his discretion, to the executive committee of the United Confederate Veterans, for use in connection with the thirty-fourth annual reunion of the United Confederate Veterans, to be held in Memphis, Tenn., June 4 to 6, 1924, such tents, with necessary poles, ridges and planks, cots, blankets, pillows, chairs or camp stools, etc., as may be required at said reunion: *Provided*, That no expense shall be caused the United States Government by the delivery and return of said property, the same to be delivered to said committee designated at such time prior to the holding of said convention as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of War and Thornton Newsum, chairman of said executive committee: *And provided further*, That the Secretary of War shall, before delivering such property, take from said Thornton Newsum a good and sufficient bond for the safe return of said property in good order and condition, and the whole without expense to the United States.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

TEMPORARY PONTOON BRIDGE ACROSS CALUMET RIVER, COUNTY OF COOK, ILL.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 2865) to authorize the city of Chicago to construct a temporary pontoon bridge across the Calumet River in the vicinity of One hundred and thirty-fourth Street, in the county of Cook, State of Illinois.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, is this a toll bridge?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. There are no toll bridges in Illinois that I know of.

Mr. BLANTON. This will be no toll bridge?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. No; this is in the city of Chicago.

Mr. BLANTON. There is a toll bridge in Chicago, and I have been over it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the city of Chicago, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Illinois, be, and is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a temporary pontoon bridge and approaches thereto across the Calumet River in the vicinity of One hundred and thirty-fourth Street, in section 36, township 37 north, range 14 east of the third principal meridian, in the county of Cook, State of Illinois, as shown on plan, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, after the word "That," insert the words "the consent of Congress is hereby granted to."

Page 1, line 5, strike out the words "be, and is hereby, authorized."

Page 1, line 7, after the word "River," insert the words "at a point suitable to the interests of navigation."

Page 2, line 4, insert the words "city of Chicago."

Page 2, lines 4 and 5, after the word "Illinois," strike out the words "as shown on plan."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, I offer another amendment, which is included in the report but not shown in the bill itself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CHINDBLOM: In line 6, on page 1, strike out the words "temporary pontoon."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the title will be amended.

There was no objection.

BRIDGE ACROSS MISSISSIPPI RIVER BETWEEN CARROLL COUNTY, ILL., AND JACKSON COUNTY, IOWA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 7063) granting the consent of Congress to the State of Illinois and the State of Iowa, or either of them, to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River connecting the county of Carroll, Ill., and the county of Jackson, Iowa.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the State of Illinois, and the State of Iowa, or either of them, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Mississippi River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near the city of Savanna, in the county of Carroll, Ill., and the city of Sabula, in the county of Jackson, in the State of Iowa, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill granting the consent of Congress to the State of Illinois and the State of Iowa, or either of them, to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River connecting the county of Carroll, Ill., and the county of Jackson, Iowa."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the title will be amended. There was no objection.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE FOX RIVER IN ST. CHARLES TOWNSHIP, KANE COUNTY, ILL.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 7104) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Fox River in St. Charles township, Kane County, Ill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, there is on the Speaker's table a bill of the same purport which has been passed by the Senate and I ask unanimous consent that it be substituted for the House bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that the Senate bill be substituted for the House bill. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2597) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Fox River in St. Charles Township, Kane County, Ill.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Aurora, Elgin & Fox River Electric Co., a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Illinois, and its successors and assigns, be, and they are hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Fox River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, in section 11 of township 40 north, range 8 east of the third principal meridian, being St. Charles Township, Kane County, Ill., in accordance with the act of Congress entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, the committee offered some amendments to the bill to make it uniform with the other legislation, which are not contained in the Senate bill, I find.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman offer an amendment to the Senate bill?

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, would it be in order to offer an amendment as reported by the House committee?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks so.

Mr. MAPES. If so, I will submit the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 3, after the word "that," insert "the consent of Congress is hereby granted to"; and in line 5, after the word "assigns," strike out the words "be and they are hereby authorized."

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in what respects do these amendments, if adopted, modify the House bill as reported by the House committee?

Mr. MAPES. It will not change the effect of the bill at all, but the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has been endeavoring to follow out the suggestions of the War Department and make all of these bridge bills uniform, and it is for that reason I am offering this amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee, I think, misunderstands the gentleman. The gentleman from Michigan is offering the amendment to make it conform to the House bill.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I see.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The question was taken, and the amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the title will be amended. There was no objection.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

TO LIMIT THE POWER OF UNITED STATES COURTS TO EXPRESS OPINIONS AS TO THE CREDIBILITY OF WITNESSES OR WEIGHT OF TESTIMONY

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 3260) to amend the practice and procedure in Federal courts, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BEGG. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I find myself in an embarrassing position. I told the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McKEOWN] a little while ago I would not object, and I perhaps will not, after I have called a matter to the attention of the Members who are lawyers. Not claiming to know anything about law, I want to point out—

Mr. McKEOWN. I will say to the gentleman that I did not refer to this particular bill.

Mr. BEGG. Then I will object.

Mr. McKEOWN. I hope the gentleman will reserve his objection and let me explain the situation.

Mr. BEGG. I will say to the gentleman that I will object anyhow. I thought I was bound by my word to the gentleman.

Mr. McKEOWN. It is the next bill that the gentleman agreed not to object to.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, I object.

PROVIDING FOR ADDITIONAL PLACE FOR HOLDING UNITED STATES COURTS IN THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA AT ADA, OKLA.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 714) to amend section 101 of the Judicial Code.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 714) to amend section 101 of the Judicial Code.

Be it enacted, etc., That section 101 of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911, as amended by the act approved February 20, 1917, be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 101. The State of Oklahoma is divided into two judicial districts, to be known as the eastern and western districts of Oklahoma.

"The eastern district shall include the territory embraced on the 1st day of July, 1916, in the counties of Adair, Atoka, Bryan, Craig, Cherokee, Creek, Choctaw, Coal, Carter, Delaware, Garvin, Grady, Haskell, Hughes, Jefferson, Johnston, Latimer, Le Flore, Love, McClain, Mayes, Muskogee, McIntosh, McCurtain, Murray, Marshall, Nowata, Ottawa, Okmulgee, Okfuskee, Pittsburg, Pushmataha, Pontotoc, Rogers, Stephens, Sequoyah, Seminole, Tulsa, Washington, and Wagoner. Terms of the district court for the eastern district shall be held at Muskogee on the first Monday in January, at Vinita on the first Monday in March, at Tulsa on the first Monday in April, at South McAlester on the first Monday in June, at Ardmore on the first Monday in October, at Chickasha on the first Monday in November, and at Ada on the first Monday in December of each year: *Provided*, That suitable rooms and accommodations for holding court at Ada shall be furnished free to the United States.

"The western district shall include the territory embraced on the 1st day of July, 1916, in the counties of Alfalfa, Beaver, Beckham, Blaine, Caddo, Canadian, Cimarron, Cleveland, Comanche, Cotton, Custer, Dewey, Ellis, Garfield, Grant, Greer, Harmon, Harper, Jackson, Kay, Kingfisher, Kiowa, Lincoln, Logan, Major, Noble, Oklahoma, Osage, Pawnee, Payne, Pottawatomie, Roger Mills, Texas, Tillman, Washita, Woods, and Woodward. Terms of the district court for the western district shall be held at Oklahoma City on the first Monday in January, at Enid on the first Monday in March, at Guthrie on the first Monday in May, at Lawton on the first Monday in September, and at Woodward on the second Monday in November: *Provided*, That suitable rooms and accommodations for holding court at Woodward are furnished free of expense to the United States.

"The clerk of the district court for the eastern district shall keep his office at Muskogee and the clerk for the western district at Guthrie, and shall maintain an office in charge of himself or a deputy at Oklahoma City."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

FLOMATON, STATE OF ALABAMA

Mr. JEFFERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 4437) to quiet title in the municipality of Flo-

maton, State of Alabama, to which I objected, may retain its place on the calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL SOCIETY OF THE SONS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 7399) to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to incorporate the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution," approved June 9, 1906.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of the act entitled "An act to incorporate the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution," approved June 9, 1906, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. That the property and affairs of said corporation shall be managed by not less than 40 trustees, who shall be elected annually at such time as shall be fixed by the by-laws, and at least one trustee shall be elected annually from a list of nominees to be made by each of the State societies and submitted in this society at least 30 days before the annual meeting, in accordance with the general provisions regulating such nominations as may be adopted by this society."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

COUNTY OF CUSTER, MONT.

The next bill on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 3756) granting to the county of Custer, State of Montana, certain land in said county for use as a fairground.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to convey by patent to the county of Custer, State of Montana, for use as a fairground, the following tract of public land:

Beginning at a point which is south 5° 30' west of the center of section 33, township 9 north, range 47 east, of Montana principal meridian, and distant therefrom 2,280 feet; thence south 41° 30' west 1,080 feet; thence north 73° 20' west 1,925 feet; thence north 16° 40' east 2,375 feet; thence north 68° 10' east 345 feet; thence south 35° 45' east 2,655 feet, to the point of beginning, containing 96½ acres, more or less.

That this grant is made upon the payment of \$1.25 per acre, and before patent may issue the Secretary of the Interior shall cause a survey to be made of the land herein granted, and that there shall be excepted from such survey and from the grant herein made land covered by the Tongue River and the new channel thereof.

Which patent shall be issued upon the express condition that the county of Custer shall use said tract of land as a fairground for the benefit of the citizens of said county: *Provided*, That whenever said lands cease to be used by said county for use as a fairground or are attempted to be sold or conveyed, then, and in that event, title to such lands and the whole thereof shall revert to the United States: *Provided further*, That such patent shall contain a reservation to the United States of all gas, oil, coal, and other mineral deposits that may be found in such land and the right to the use of the land for extracting and removing the same.

[Note: Bill S. 303 is supposed to have passed.]

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO MILES CITY, STATE OF MONTANA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 4319) authorizing the conveyance of certain land to the city of Miles City, State of Montana, for park purposes.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby is, authorized and directed to convey by patent to the city of Miles City, a municipal corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Montana, the following tract of public land, to wit:

Beginning at a point which is south 18° 15' west from the center of section 33, township 8 north, of range 47 east, Montana principal meridian, and distant therefrom 1,660 feet; thence north 36° 0' west 1,885 feet; thence north 68° 10' east 1,105 feet; thence north 88° 40'

east 380 feet; thence south 59° 5' east 375 feet; thence south 28° 35' east 365 feet; thence south 12° 50' east 285 feet; thence south 14° 10' west 215 feet; thence south 40° 25' west 325 feet; thence south 46° 25' west 505 feet; thence south 29° 30' west 390 feet to the point of beginning, containing 48½ acres, more or less.

That this grant is made upon the payment of \$1.25 per acre, and before patent may issue the Secretary of the Interior shall cause a survey to be made of the tract herein granted, and that there shall be excepted from such survey and from the grant herein made the land covered by the Tongue River.

Said patent shall be issued upon the express condition that the city of Miles City shall use said tract of land for municipal purposes as a public park for the benefit of the citizens of said city: *Provided*, That whenever said lands shall cease to be used by said city for municipal purposes or attempted to be sold or conveyed, then, and in that event, title to such lands and the whole thereof shall revert to the United States: *Provided further*, That such patent shall contain a reservation to the United States of all gas, oil, coal, and other mineral deposits as may be found in such land and the right to the use of the land for extracting and removing the same.

[Note: Bill S. 303 is supposed to have passed.]

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER AT MINNEAPOLIS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 2488) to authorize the city of Minneapolis in the State of Minnesota to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River in said city.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the city of Minneapolis, in the county of Hennepin and State of Minnesota, a municipal corporation organized under the laws of the State of Minnesota, be, and it is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Mississippi River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, extending from a point at or near the intersection of Cedar Avenue and Second Street south across the Mississippi River to a point at or near the intersection of Tenth Avenue and University Avenue SE, in the city of Minneapolis, in the State of Minnesota, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER AT NEW ORLEANS, LA.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 2656) granting the consent of Congress to the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River near and above the city of New Orleans, La.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the city of New Orleans, a municipal corporation existing under the laws of the State of Louisiana, its successors and assigns, through its public belt railroad commission, as authorized by the constitution of the State of Louisiana, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Mississippi River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, near and above the said city, in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That this act shall be null and void unless the construction of said bridge is commenced within two years and completed within five years from the date of approval hereof.

SEC. 3. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT AND CIRCUIT COURTS AT POTEAU, OKLA.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 644) providing for the holding of the United States district and circuit courts at Poteau, Okla.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That a term of the district court of the United States for the eastern district of Oklahoma shall be held in each and every year in the town of Poteau, Okla., beginning on the first Monday in October and continuing until the business is disposed of.

SEC. 2. That the clerk of the United States district and circuit courts at Muskogee, Okla., shall be the clerk of the United States district and circuit courts at Poteau, Okla., until provision be made by law for the appointment of deputy clerks at the several places of holding United States district and circuit courts in the State of Oklahoma.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, insert "*Provided*, That suitable rooms and accommodations for holding court at Poteau are furnished free of expense to the United States.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

EASTERN JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 162) to amend the act establishing the eastern judicial district of Oklahoma.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That two terms of the court of two weeks each, or more, in the discretion of the presiding judge, in the eastern judicial district of the State of Oklahoma, for the trial of civil and criminal cases, shall, after the passage and approval of this act, be held at Pauls Valley, Okla., each year, in said district.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 8, insert: "*Provided*, That suitable rooms and accommodations for holding court at Pauls Valley are furnished free of expense to the United States."

Mr. SWANK. Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for two terms a year of two weeks each. I want to change that, and move to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following in lieu thereof, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. SWANK: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That a term of the United States district court for the eastern judicial district of the State of Oklahoma shall be held annually at Pauls Valley, Okla., for the trial of civil and criminal cases, at such times as may be fixed by the judges of the eastern judicial district of Oklahoma: *Provided*, That suitable rooms and accommodations for holding court at Pauls Valley are furnished free of expense to the United States."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask recognition on the amendment. I notice that both in the preceding bill, providing for a court at Poteau, Okla., and also in this bill, at Pauls Valley, the committee has required that the people of those places shall secure a courthouse and furnish it free to the United States.

Mr. SWANK. That is provided for in the amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. I know; but I do not see why that should be done.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman does not mean to say build a courthouse? They have to furnish it free.

Mr. BLANTON. And provide for quarters. They have to provide a courthouse for holding court there.

Mr. YATES. They have to provide a place.

Mr. BLANTON. I will tell the gentleman what kind of a "place" a Federal judge requires. You have to have a suitable court room, and you have to have proper jury rooms, with jury accommodations, both for the grand jury and the petit jury, and you have to have witness rooms, and you have to provide quarters for the judge for his private office in the court room. That is the kind of a "place" that a Federal judge requires to be furnished.

Mr. DYER. But this is the county seat, and they have already these things there.

Mr. BLANTON. It is of no interest to me except that I happen to be acquainted some in Pauls Valley, Okla. Those are awfully good people there; some are as fine as anywhere in the country, and my colleague knows it, and why should those good people of Pauls Valley, Okla., be required to furnish a Federal courthouse?

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I do not understand why this great Federal Government of the United States, which can pay \$40,000 for a

little junketing trip over to Europe, does not provide its own court room and its own facilities for holding court. I do not think this committee ought to require this of these towns in Oklahoma. If it were in Chicago, they would not have to furnish it.

Mr. YATES. Oh, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. If it were in Philadelphia, they would not have to furnish it; but down in Pauls Valley, Okla., the people are different from the people in Philadelphia and Chicago in the eyes of Congress. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman knows, of course, that there is a court room there with jury rooms and ample accommodations.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; I know; but sometimes there is not room for holding a State court and a Federal court at the same time.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended to read as follows: "A bill to amend the act establishing the eastern judicial district of Oklahoma, to establish a term of the United States District Court for the Eastern Judicial District of Oklahoma at Pauls Valley, Okla."

GRANTING PUBLIC LAND TO SHREVEPORT, LA.

The next business was the bill (H. R. 5573) granting certain public lands to the city of Shreveport, La., for reservoir purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the gentleman from Illinois that there is a provision in the bill for reversion back to the Government in case they do not use this for a reservoir.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, we have had some bills of this kind before the House, particularly the other evening when we considered private bills. As I understand it, this is a grant of lands belonging to the Federal Government to the city of Shreveport.

Mr. BEGG. That is it; but they must be used for a water supply for the city; otherwise the land reverts to the Government.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to issue patent or patents to the city of Shreveport, La., for use in the establishment of a reservoir for the water supply of said city, for all those tracts of land within what is known as the Cross Lake area, in townships 17 and 18 north, range 15 west, Louisiana meridian, which may be found by the Secretary of the Interior to have been islands in said Cross Lake at the date the State of Louisiana was admitted to the Union, and to which tracts no legal claims have been initiated and duly maintained under the provisions of the public land laws, and shall be timely asserted as provided herein: *Provided*, That the said city of Shreveport shall pay for said lands at the rate of \$1.25 per acre, and shall tender its application for patent, accompanied by the purchase price of the land, within six months after the approval of this act, or within a similar period after the acceptance of the official plat or plats of survey if accepted after the date of this act.

SEC. 2. That no claim alleged to have been initiated and maintained under the public land laws adverse to the disposition of said lands as provided for by this act shall be recognized unless regularly presented to the Secretary of the Interior within the period allowed the city of Shreveport to file its application for patent, and no tract to which an adverse claim is asserted shall be patented to the city unless and until such claim is finally rejected by the Secretary of the Interior.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 9, after the word "act," insert: "*Provided further*, That there shall be reserved to the United States all gas, oil, coal, or other mineral deposits found at any time in the said lands and the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same."

Page 2, line 21, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 3. That the lands hereby granted shall be used by the city of Shreveport, La., only for the purpose expressed in the grant, and if said land, or any part thereof, shall be abandoned for such use it shall

revert to the United States; and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and empowered to determine the facts and declare such forfeiture and restore said land to the public domain, and such order of the Secretary shall be final and conclusive."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

WELFARE OF MATERNITY AND INFANCY

The next business was the bill (H. R. 6142) amending an act for the promotion of the welfare of maternity and infancy, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice and retain its place on the calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

TERM OF COURT AT CASPER, WYO.

The next bill on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 1445) to amend section 115 of the act of March 3, 1911, entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary."

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. I ask that it be reported; it is short.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 115 of the act approved March 3, 1911, entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 115. The State of Wyoming and the Yellowstone National Park shall constitute one judicial district, to be known as the district of Wyoming. Terms of the district court for said district shall be held at Cheyenne on the second Mondays in May and November, at Casper on the first Monday in February, at Evanston on the second Tuesday in July, and at Lander on the first Monday in October; and the said court shall hold one session annually at Sheridan, and in said national park, on such dates as the court may order. The marshal and clerk of the said court shall each, respectively, appoint at least one deputy to reside at Casper, and one to reside at Evanston, and one to reside at Lander, and shall also maintain an office at each of those places: *Provided*, That, until a public building is provided at Casper, suitable accommodations for holding court in said town shall be furnished the Government at an expense not to exceed \$300 annually. The marshal of the United States for the said district may appoint one or more deputy marshals for the Yellowstone National Park, who shall reside in said park."

The committee amendment was read as follows:

Page 2, line 12, strike out the words "the Government at an expense not to exceed \$300 annually" and insert in lieu thereof "free of expense to the United States."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. LONGWORTH. It seems quite evident it will be impossible to finish this entire list at the rate we are now going.

Mr. BLANTON. And we will not go this fast later on.

Mr. LONGWORTH. If the House desires to remain until 6, I, personally, have no objection, but it seems to me it might possibly be wise to set aside a night this week—if it is the disposition of the House, I have no objection—

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The gentleman from Texas, so I have understood, indicated he did not care for the House to remain in session very much longer this afternoon. If he will withhold the point of no quorum and let us run until 6—

Mr. BLANTON. I do not want the minority leader to put me in a bad attitude. I want to say this: There are only a few here. The House knows those who work on these bills and who make objection to them when they come up are few in number and they stay here all the time. The others do not stay unless they want to do so. I do not think it is fair for the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG], who does some of this

work, and others; I do not think it is fair to those who work on these bills and try to see whether they are good or not, who have to stay here all the time and—

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I am not criticizing. The point is this: If the point was going to be made in a few moments I would like to have an agreement—

Mr. LONGWORTH. If the gentleman is willing to have it understood we stay until 6 o'clock, I do not think it will be necessary, but let us have an understanding.

Mr. BLANTON. I will stay until 6 o'clock.

TAX ON BREAD

Mr. OLIVER of New York. Mr. Speaker, may I be allowed to extend my remarks?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. OLIVER of New York. Mr. Speaker, the recent action of the President in increasing by proclamation the tariff taxes on wheat and flour will have an important bearing on the price of bread. Under the last Republican tariff bill the President was given power to increase or decrease all tariff rates provided for by law. He has refused to decrease the tariff taxes on the necessities of life and now signifies his contempt for the vote of protest in 1922 by increasing the tariff on bread. He has increased the duty on wheat from 30 cents a bushel to 42 cents a bushel. He has increased the duty on flour from 78 cents a hundred pounds to \$1.04 a hundred pounds. The result of the tariff on sugar is a safe measure of the result of this tariff on bread. The President's purpose is to aid the farmers of America by shutting out the competition of the wheat and flour grown in Canada.

All of the evidence before the country justifies the President in judging the condition of the farmers as extremely bad and acute to the actuality of hundreds of thousands of foreclosures and bankruptcies. All of this has happened under the present tariff law. What has contributed to bringing about this condition? Is the right remedy an increase in the tariff rates on wheat and flour? What parts of the population of America other than the farmers have asked for an increase in tariff taxes? Will any other vast multitude of people be hurt by the method now taken to help the farmer?

It is plain that the unfortunate financial condition of the farmer has been caused by tariff taxes on everything the farmer must buy for the operation of his farm. He buys in a taxed market and sells in an untaxed market. When he drives into town and sits in his wagon smoking his pipe, guiding his horses along the road to the market place or to the freight depot he thinks to himself, "The horse's shoes, his harness, whip, the wagon, my clothes, shoes, and hat have all cost me a tariff tax. My plow, scythe, threshing machine, fertilizer, milk churn, ax, hammer, saws, my wire fences, the furniture in my house, and everything my family needs has cost me more money because of the tariff tax. Yet, what I have on my wagon here—wheat or flour—I have got to sell in an untaxed market and let the other fellow get the profits—the railroad, the miller, the baker, the retailer." When the farmer figures up the profits on his sales and the expenses of his purchases, he finds that the tariff tax has driven him to put a lock on his home and sell out if his bank has not already sold him out at a foreclosure sale.

What will he gain by an increase in the tariff on wheat and flour? At best it will only keep him from being driven into financial ruin a little faster than he is being driven now. It will not prevent his ruin under the existing conditions. Why? Because an increase in tariff rates on wheat and flour will not benefit until the miller, baker, and retailer have taken their share of the profits allowed by the higher tariff. The remainder they will let the farmer have. The fallacy of the increase in tariff on wheat and flour is no one can guarantee that a fair percentage of the higher price to be charged for bread will be paid to the laborer of the fields—producer of wheat. All it can guarantee is that the man who ultimately sells the bread—the miller, the baker, and retailer—can raise the price higher without fear of competition and with the legal sanction of the Federal Government. The Department of Agriculture in its report of March 20 shows that the farmer at present receives but 15 per cent, which is less than one-sixth, of the final price of bread. Will a sixth of an increase of 3 or 4 cents a loaf save the farmer from destruction? The department also shows that out of the final price of a loaf of bread in New York the retailer receives 15½ per cent; the baker, 57½ per cent; the railroad, 5½ per cent; the miller, 5½ per cent. How does the farmer know that the miller, the baker, and retailer will allow him any increase? Will he have to resort to a strike or boycott or lockout to get it, as labor has been compelled to do to secure

a fraction of a living wage from the tariff barons? The advisers of the President think the farmer is a "rube." Instead of reducing the tariff on the things the farmer must buy, he increases the tariff on wheat and flour, which the farmer must sell, without being able to guarantee the farmer that he will receive one penny of the increase which will surely be made in the price of bread.

The President has heard no appeal from the masses of the people who reside in the cities asking him to increase the tariff tax on wheat and flour and thus encourage and license an increase in the price of bread. He has heard no appeal from the people of the Bronx. We have a population of 800,000 people, and not one of them has asked that the price of bread be increased. In the last congressional campaign, fought by the Democratic Party against the increased tariff on the necessities of life, the Bronx spoke in no uncertain terms. It issued a warning that the fraud was apparent and it knew that the tariff laws had been leased out for the benefit of the favored few who sought to oppress and rob the masses of America. The advisers of the President must think the farmer is a "rube" and the city folks "boobs" if they believe that an increase in the price of bread will make him a popular political hero. A smaller loaf at the present price or a higher price for the present loaf will be the result of the President's act in increasing the tariff tax on bread. It is a tax on the bellies of the poor. When the fight for the necessities of life is hard, any man who helps to make the life of the masses of the poor more oppressive and who brings them nearer to starvation commits a moral wrong, as cruel and cold-blooded as any wrong defined in the Penal Code. To the farmer the President offers whatever the miller, the baker, and the retailer will allow to him. The farmer will get the remains of one plunder while he is the victim of the tariff plunder of everyone who sells him what he needs. To the city folks the President offers a smaller loaf at the present price or the present loaf at a higher price. We can take whatever choice the baker makes. Now that the tariff tax is fixed to take effect April 7, the President retires to count his delegates, and the baker, the miller, and retailer, backed up by the full force of the President's approval, will meet to determine how to fool the "rubes" and "boobs."

The new tariff takes effect to-day, April 7. It is the first aggressive policy of the President to be put into operation. It is a measure of his mind, its sympathies, and his statesmanship. He has scorned the masses of the poor in the cities to fool the farmer. Temporary leader of the party that opposes paternalism, he gives to the baker and the miller the full force of Government aid which they do not need, and in the name of the Federal Government he offers to the farmer what the benevolence of the miller and baker will allow him to take. To the city dweller he offers the bill for his statesmanship. April 7, 1924, ushers in the new tax on bread. I trust that this crowning infamy of tariff cruelty will mark the end of a system of taxation that rests on the backs and bellies of the masses of America in order that a few might enjoy an unhealthy and unjust luxury and money power.

TRANSFER OF FORT KEOGH MILITARY RESERVATION, MONT., TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The next bill on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 4840) authorizing the Secretary of War to transfer jurisdiction over a portion of the Fort Keogh Military Reservation, Mont., to the United States Department of Agriculture for agricultural experimental purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute Senate bill 2690.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BEGG. Is this Senate bill the same as this bill as amended?

Mr. LEAVITT. Just the same.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War having determined that the lands embraced in the Fort Keogh Military Reservation, in the State of Montana, are no longer needed for military purposes, an Executive order of February 2, 1924, having transferred the said lands to the Department of the Interior for disposition, and said lands are hereby transferred to and placed under the control of the United States Department of Agriculture for use by that department for experiments in stock raising and growing of forage crops in connection therewith: *Provided,* That if the lands are not used for the purpose mentioned herein, or having been used for such purpose, are subsequently abandoned

as being no longer needed for such purpose, then, and in that event, the said land shall revert to, and become subject to the control and jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior: *Provided further,* That this transfer shall not affect any existing legal rights to lands in the reservation: *And provided further,* That there shall be excepted from the effect hereof that portion of said reservation described as follows:

A tract beginning at a point which is south 18° 15' west from the center of section 33, township 8 north of range 47 east, Montana principal meridian, and distant therefrom 1,660 feet; thence north 36° no minutes west 1,885 feet; thence north 68° 10' east 1,105 feet; thence north 88° 40' east 380 feet; thence south 59° 5' east 375 feet; thence south 28° 35' east 365 feet; thence south 12° 50' east 285 feet; thence south 14° 10' west 215 feet; thence south 40° 25' west 325 feet; thence south 46° 25' west 505 feet; thence south 29° 30' west 390 feet to the point of beginning, containing 48.3 acres, more or less.

Also, a tract beginning at a point which is south 5° 30' west of the center of section 33, township 8 north, range 47 east, of Montana principal meridian, and distant therefrom 2,280 feet; thence south 41° 30' west 1,080 feet; thence north 73° 20' west 1,925 feet; thence north 16° 40' east 2,375 feet; thence north 68° 10' east 340 feet; thence south 35° 45' east 2,655 feet to the point of beginning, containing 96.1 acres, more or less.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The SPEAKER. A similar House bill will lie on the table. Also House bill 7104.

INTERNATIONAL STATISTICAL INSTITUTE AT THE HAGUE

The next bill on the Consent Calendar was Senate Joint Resolution 160, authorizing the maintenance by the United States of membership in the International Statistical Bureau at The Hague.

The clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to explain that. Will the gentleman withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. BLANTON. If the House is willing to hear the gentleman, I will reserve the right to object, but I think, Mr. Speaker, I shall object later.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this statistical institute that is provided for here was established in 1885. Now we have been a member—

Mr. BLANTON. That will furnish an excuse for how many of us to go over there?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. It does not pay for anybody's expenses at all.

Mr. BLANTON. What excuse will it offer for somebody's expenses to be paid?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. It simply publishes in English and sends over our statistics. There are 12 nations now that are members of this organization. They get out the statistics, and we want our statistics to be authentic.

Mr. BLANTON. I have served notice on the Department of Agriculture that until they find a solution for the grasshopper pest I am going to object to these expenditures. The grasshoppers are eating the farmers up in some States, and the Department of Agriculture in 50 years has not found a solution of the problem.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard. The Clerk will report the next bill.

COTTON CROP REPORTS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 2112) authorizing the Department of Agriculture to issue semi-monthly cotton crop reports and providing for their publication simultaneously with the ginning reports of the Department of Commerce.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. MADDEN. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his objection?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes, for a statement; but I am going to object to it.

Mr. RANKIN. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that this bill is one that was agreed upon some time ago, to coordinate the ginners' report and the cotton-crop reports.

Mr. MADDEN. Is this a duplication?

Mr. RANKIN. No.

Mr. SWANK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. SWANK. I will say to the gentleman that on the 1st of December last a conference was called of Members from the cotton States, and they appointed several committees to draft legislation of this nature. One subcommittee, of which the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] was chairman, Senator HARRIS, of Georgia, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO], the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE], and myself were members, had conferences with the Department of Commerce and the Agriculture Department, and this is one of the results of those conferences.

Mr. MADDEN. Was this bill submitted to the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. SWANK. It was submitted to both of them. This has reference to the report made by the Department of Agriculture. Mr. MADDEN. Suppose they do not cooperate?

Mr. SWANK. This bill provides that they shall cooperate.

Mr. RANKIN. At this meeting, I will say to the gentleman, we had representatives of the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Commerce or the Bureau of the Census, and they agreed upon this coordination.

Mr. MADDEN. Why do they not cooperate in the work? That is the trouble. They are always duplicating. Each one must do it.

Mr. RANKIN. No. The ginners' report is under the Department of Commerce. They collect statistics respecting the number of bales of cotton ginned up to a certain period. The crop estimate is got out by the Department of Agriculture. Last year there was a great deal of trouble. The reports were coming out so infrequently that it was impossible to keep up with the changing conditions throughout the Cotton Belt.

Mr. MADDEN. Of course I want to see the cotton growers get all the information they can, but I can not see any sense in having the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Commerce and the Bureau of the Census having friction, as this indicates. It shows that neither one of them can do anything without the cooperation of the other.

Mr. RANKIN. I will explain that. Here is the danger. We make these reports come out on the same day and at the same time for this reason: If the ginners' reports were to come out one day and indicate a certain production, the chances are that it would run the market up or down. Then when the crop-estimating report came out, if it indicated a different amount, it would have the opposite effect. That is what occurred last year, and it resulted disastrously, not only to the cotton growers but to the spinners throughout the country.

Mr. MADDEN. If all of this were done by one department, there would be no such friction.

Mr. RANKIN. We have no way of getting it done by one department.

Mr. MADDEN. Why not?

Mr. RANKIN. We would have to destroy the Department of Commerce or take the Bureau of the Census out of the Commerce Department and put it in the Department of Agriculture. They gather statistics and their reports are absolutely correct. Now, in order to get this work done in any way it will have to be done in the manner indicated here. We not only had the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Commerce present, but we had present representatives of the various agricultural organizations, and at one of these meetings, down in the Department of Agriculture, we had the representatives of the manufacturers.

Mr. SWANK. I would like to say a word to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] if I had a chance.

Mr. MADDEN. What I want to prevent is duplication.

Mr. BEGG. If the gentleman from Illinois does not object, I will. This is the same bill that we passed over the other day.

Mr. SWANK. No; it is an altogether different bill.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The gentleman from Illinois is mistaken about that. Is not the gentleman willing that it be passed over?

Mr. SWANK. And retain its place on the calendar?

Mr. BEGG. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the bill will be passed over and retain its place on the calendar. The Clerk will report the next bill.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE MISSOURI RIVER, S. DAK.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 2332) granting the consent of Congress to the State of South Dakota for the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River between Hughes County and Stanley County, S. Dak.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the State of South Dakota to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Missouri River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, between Hughes County and Stanley County, S. Dak., in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

REAGAN COUNTY, TEX.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 8050) to detach Reagan County, in the State of Texas, from the El Paso division of the western judicial district of Texas and attach said county to the San Angelo division of the northern judicial district of said State.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Reagan County, in the State of Texas, be, and the same is hereby, detached from the El Paso division of the western judicial district of Texas and attached to and made a part of the San Angelo division of the northern judicial district of said State.

SEC. 2. That all process against persons resident in said county of Reagan and cognizable before the United States district court shall be issued out of and made returnable to said court at San Angelo, and that all prosecutions against persons for offenses committed in said county of Reagan shall be tried in said court at San Angelo: *Provided*, That no civil or criminal cause begun and pending prior to the passage of this act shall be in any way affected by it.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

PUNISHMENT FOR UNLAWFUL BREAKING OF SEALS OF RAILWAY CARS, ETC.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 4168) to amend an act entitled "An act to punish the unlawful breaking of seals of railroad cars containing interstate or foreign shipments, the unlawful entering of such cars, the stealing of freight and express packages or baggage or articles in process of transportation in interstate shipment, and the felonious asportation of such freight or express packages or baggage or articles therefrom into another district of the United States, and the felonious possession or reception of the same," approved February 13, 1913 (37 Stat. L. p. 670).

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Reserving the right to object, in what particular does this amend the act?

Mr. DYER. This amendment is to provide for the prosecution of those who steal from the interstate shipments while they are being transported from one State to another.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The original act does that.

Mr. DYER. I mean in any kind of a vehicle or wagon. For instance, take my own case. In East St. Louis, Ill., goods are all landed there and these drayage companies take them and haul them over to the other side, where they are going on through shipment. The court has decided that while they were in a wagon of that kind and away from the railroad station or depot men who steal them can not be convicted, and this is simply to cure that decision of the court.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. It means they can not be convicted in the Federal courts?

Mr. DYER. Yes; it does not extend the act in any other way.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. It gives broader jurisdiction to the Federal courts than they now possess?

Mr. DYER. It grows out of that decision. In other words, it is to make the shipment of the goods complete during their entire transit, whether they are in the railroad depot, in the yards, or whether they are on these drayage wagons being hauled to their proper destination.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the bill be passed but retain its place on the calendar.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the bill be passed but retain its place on the calendar. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

CHINA TRADE ACT

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 7190) to amend the China trade act, 1922.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. I object.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the bill retain its place on the calendar without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the bill retain its place on the calendar. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

BRIDGE ACROSS NORTH BRANCH OF SUSQUEHANNA RIVER FROM WILKES-BARRE TO THE BOROUGH OF DORRANCETON, PA.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 7846) to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the north branch of the Susquehanna River from the city of Wilkes-Barre to the borough of Dorranceton, Pa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the time for commencing and completing the reconstruction of a bridge authorized by act of Congress approved September 7, 1916, as renewed and extended by joint resolution approved February 15, 1921, to be constructed by the county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, across the North Branch of the Susquehanna River, from the city of Wilkes-Barre to the borough of Dorranceton, in said county of Luzerne and the State of Pennsylvania, are hereby extended one and three years, respectively, from the date of approval hereof.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

SCHOOL SITE FOR UTE INDIANS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 2882) to provide for the reservation of certain land in Utah as a school site for Ute Indians.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby withdrawn from settlement, occupancy, or disposal under the laws of the United States, and set apart and reserved for and as a school site for the benefit of the Ute Indians, an unsurveyed tract of land in San Juan County, Utah, located in township 36 south, range 21 east, Salt Lake meridian, approximately the northeast quarter of the southwest quarter of section 7.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

RESERVATION OF LANDS IN UTAH FOR PAIUTE INDIANS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 2884) providing for the reservation of certain lands in Utah for certain bands of Paiute Indians.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby withdrawn from settlement, occupancy, or disposal under the laws of the United States, and set apart and reserved for the use, benefit, and occupancy of certain bands of Paiute Indians, and such other Indians of this tribe as the Secretary of the Interior may see fit to settle thereon, subject, however, to any valid existing rights of any persons thereto, the tracts of land in the State of Utah, particularly described as follows: Sections 21, 22, 23, and 24, township 29 south, range 18 west, Salt Lake meridian.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

EXTENSION OF PERIOD OF RESTRICTION AGAINST ALIENATION ON HOMESTEAD ALLOTMENTS, KANSAS OR KAW TRIBE OF INDIANS IN OKLAHOMA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 2887) to authorize the extension of the period of restriction against alienation on the homestead allotments made to members of the Kansas or Kaw Tribe of Indians in Oklahoma.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the period of restriction against alienation on homestead lands allotted to members of the Kansas or Kaw Tribe of Indians in Oklahoma, under the provisions of the agreement with said tribe of Indians as ratified and confirmed by the act of Congress of July 1, 1902 (32 Stat. L., p. 636), be, and is hereby, extended for a period of 20 years from January 1, 1928.

With the following committee amendment:

Provided, That the extension authorized by this act shall not affect the homestead allotment of any member of the Kaw Tribe who has been or may be declared to be competent by the Secretary of the Interior, after proper inquiry and investigation of conditions in such manner as he may deem necessary: *Provided further,* That the production of oil and gas and other minerals on such restricted lands may be taxed by the State of Oklahoma in all respects the same as production on restricted lands, and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to cause to be paid the tax so assessed against the royalty interests of the respective Indian owners in such production from the royalties or from any other individual Indian funds held under his supervision belonging to the Indian owner of the land: *Provided, however,* That such tax shall not become a lien or charge of any kind or character against the land or other property of the Indian owner.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized, when it would be for the best interests of a restricted Kaw Indian, to permit the sale of his homestead allotment under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe and upon such terms as he may approve.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The question was taken, and the committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE SAVANNAH RIVER NEAR AUGUSTA, GA.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 8180) to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act authorizing the counties of Aiken, S. C., and Richmond, Ga., to construct a bridge across the Savannah River at or near Augusta, Ga.," approved August 7, 1919.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 2538, which lies on the Speaker's desk and which is identical with the bill just reported, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to consider the Senate bill in lieu of the House bill. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (S. 2538) to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act authorizing the counties of Aiken, S. C., and Richmond, Ga., to construct a bridge across the Savannah River at or near Augusta, Ga.," approved August 7, 1919.

Be it enacted, etc., That the act approved August 7, 1919, authorizing the counties of Aiken, S. C., and Richmond, Ga., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Savannah River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation at or near Augusta, Ga., be, and the same is hereby, revived and reenacted: *Provided,* That this act shall be null and void unless the actual construction of the bridge herein authorized be completed by August 7, 1925.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

CENSUS OF COTTON IN MANUFACTURING ESTABLISHMENTS AND WAREHOUSES

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the House Joint Resolution 231, directing a census to be taken of bales of cotton now held at various places.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman in charge of this bill [Mr. RANKIN] a question. This bill provides for the asking of certain questions on the part of the census in reference to the possession of cotton and various other matters. It also contains on the second page, and from lines 12 to 21 creates, a new penal offense for persons who do not give the proper information. It seems to me that when we are creating a new violation of criminal law it should be given more careful consideration than merely to get unanimous consent. I would have no objection to any part of the bill up to the creation of the new penalty.

Mr. RANKIN. I think the gentleman will find that is part of the law now. I know it is with reference to ginners and other people who give information to the Bureau of the Census.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. I wanted to ask the gentleman if that was the existing law.

Mr. RANKIN. I think it is. I know it is as to ginners and manufacturers, and so forth, that the Bureau of the Census has the right to ask for such information in compiling their statistics.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. In view of the fact that the gentleman is an expert on cotton questions, I will not make any objection.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the gentleman object to having this bill passed over? It will only mean two weeks, and I would like to get with the gentleman on these three bills.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman that this bill does not cost anything, so I am informed, and has been submitted to the Bureau of the Census for approval.

Mr. BEGG. That is one of the questions I have written down here—What is it going to cost? Why does not the Department of Agriculture do it? and a number of other questions, and I would like to have the gentleman have it passed over. It is not of vital importance.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me explain to the gentleman that it is vitally important right now. I understand the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] took this matter up with the Bureau of the Census, and they said they already had the machinery for getting this information, and they submitted this amendment which I have here and wanted it disposed of as early as possible, and for that reason the gentleman asked me to take it up for him to-day.

Mr. BEGG. How can this be done without costing anything?

Mr. RANKIN. Because they have the force now, and I think you will find in the report they state they already have the blanks. There might be a little postage involved in sending out questionnaires to these people.

Mr. BEGG. Is it to be done by mail?

Mr. RANKIN. That is my understanding.

Mr. McSWAIN. If the gentleman will pardon me, it goes to cotton mills and warehouses and also to county agents who know the cotton that is on hand in the farmers' houses, and, as I understand, it will not cost anything.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from Ohio that there was recently a serious conflict in the amount of cotton that is on hand. There was a variation in the reports or the estimates amounting to around half a million bales. That has been very detrimental to the cotton trade all the way around, and for that reason the Director of the Census and all those who are vitally interested in these matters agreed on these propositions, and they wanted the resolution passed as early as possible, so they might get the information at once.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, I will have to object.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill retain its place on the calendar.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the bill will retain its place on the calendar.

There was no objection.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE OHIO RIVER AT OWENSBORO, KY.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 8181) authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River, approximately midway between the city of Owensboro, Ky., and Rockport, Ind.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute a similar Senate bill (S. 2914).

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

An act (S. 2914) authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River, approximately midway between the city of Owensboro, Ky., and Rockport, Ind.

Be it enacted, etc., That Edward T. Franks and Thomas H. Hazelrigg, or their assigns, are hereby authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Ohio River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, approximately midway between the city of Owensboro, Daviess County, Ky., and Rockport, Spencer County, Ind., in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The House bill was laid on the table.

DIXIE POWER CO.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 2686) to authorize the Federal Power Commission to amend permit No. 1, project No. 1, issued to the Dixie Power Co.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SNELL. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask a few questions. It seems in the report, in regard to the dam, that the Federal Power Commission said that this would establish an undesirable precedent. Then a few days later they say that they have no objection. This is an important matter.

Mr. OLDFIELD. It is a very important matter. It was first threshed out with the Federal Power Commission and the Interstate Commerce Committee. The last report from the Federal Power Commission was that they agreed that this ought to be done. As a matter of fact, several hundred people in my district have expended over \$225,000 on it.

Mr. SNELL. Two hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars would not buy the plan for such a dam as is proposed here.

Mr. OLDFIELD. They have been making surveys and making plats, and with diamond drills are boring down to see about the foundation for this immense dam. They are vitally interested in it, and I want to give them a chance.

Mr. SNELL. Changing the provisions of the general power act would not seem to be a very good policy.

Mr. OLDFIELD. If this bill is not passed, some one will probably get the permit, and these local people will not have an opportunity to finance this project and carry on the development and will lose what money they have expended. What they want is to have the permit extended for 18 months to give them an opportunity to carry on the development. The persons who have been interested with these people in Arkansas have agreed that this should be passed.

Mr. SNELL. What does it mean when it says that they have made application for permits themselves?

Mr. OLDFIELD. I do not understand that, they have agreed that this bill should be passed and they are going to cooperate with the local people.

Mr. SNELL. It looks to me like some scheme to sell out.

Mr. OLDFIELD. No, they are going to try and finance it through Cooper & Co.

Mr. SNELL. Two hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars would not even start it.

Mr. OLDFIELD. They have expended their money, and unless this is passed they may not get it back.

Mr. SNELL. What would be the situation if the bill was not passed?

Mr. OLDFIELD. They would lose all of their rights.

Mr. SNELL. They would be on equal footing with every one else getting a permit.

Mr. OLDFIELD. No; they probably would not. They might claim that they had failed on the proposition and give it to some one else.

Mr. SNELL. I understand these other people who made application for a permit want to have this bill passed.

Mr. OLDFIELD. Yes, that was all threshed out before the Interstate Commerce Committee, and Cooper & Co. agreed to the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Reserving the right to object, as I understand there is no provision in the bill that would change the term of the water power act itself.

Mr. OLDFIELD. No.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Federal Power Commission be, and it is hereby, authorized and directed, on application made therefor by the Dixie Power Co., to amend preliminary permit No. 1, project No. 1, on the White River in Arkansas, issued on March 3, 1921, as amended by order of said commission on March 14, 1923, extending the expiration of said amended permit to March 1, 1924, so as to extend said permit as amended by authority of this act for 18 months from the approval of this act, such extension being desired and necessary in order to enable the permittee to prepare maps, plans, and estimates for incorporation in its application for license and to finance its project and to enable it to further test the river bed by core drilling to determine the most suitable foundation for its dam under said permit, and to enable it to comply with any other requirements of law and regulations of said power commission in making an application for a license.

SEC. 2. That all laws and parts of laws in conflict herewith be, and the same are hereby, repealed.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out lines 9 and 10, page 2.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Cotter Dam proposition affects my district directly. It is a very important matter to me and to my constituents. Three hundred or more of my people are interested directly and indirectly in this bill, and I ask that it be passed without opposition.

I beg to say to my colleagues that the enterprise is a proper one; that the Dixie Power Co. has spent more than \$200,000 in organizing and surveying, and in good faith expects to construct this dam. I beg to urge the bill's passage. It affects not only the 300 stockholders in my district and Mr. OLDFIELD's district but a great stretch of country, and thousands of people will be beneficiaries of this measure which will result in the construction of a great dam. I vouch for the good faith and integrity of all the officers, promoters, and stockholders of the company.

RELIEF OF CLAIMANTS IN MONTANA

The next business was the bill (H. R. 3511) to extend relief to the claimants in township 16 north, ranges 32 and 33 east, Montana meridian, Montana.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That if by reason of the adjustment to the plat of resurvey of entries in township 16 north of ranges 32 and 33 east of the Montana principal meridian, Montana, entrymen or their assigns have heretofore acquired or may hereafter acquire patents to a less area than such entries when made were believed to contain, the Secretary of the Interior may, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, cause patents to issue to such entrymen or their assigns for such area of surveyed, unreserved, unappropriated, nonmineral public land in the State of Montana, not containing merchantable timber, as when added to the area to which the entries were adjusted will equal the area the entries were supposed to contain when made: *Provided*, That applications for such additional area shall be filed within six months from the date of the issuance of patent or within six months from the passage hereof if patent has already issued: *Provided further*, That patents for such additional area shall issue without further final proof and without payment of fees or commissions.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

RELIEF OF BOLL-WEEVIL, DROUGHT, AND FLOOD STRICKEN FARM AREAS, OKLAHOMA

The next business was the House Joint Resolution 202, for the relief of the boll-weevil, drought, and flood stricken farm areas of Oklahoma.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House joint resolution?

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to pass the resolution over without prejudice. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL PARK, HAWAII

The next business was the bill (H. R. 4985) to repeal the first proviso of section 4 of an act to establish a national park in the Territory of Hawaii, approved August 1, 1916.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first proviso of section 4 of an act entitled "An act to establish a national park in the Territory of Hawaii," approved August 1, 1916, which is in words and figures following: "Provided, That no appropriation for the maintenance, supervision, and improvement of said park in excess of \$10,000 annually shall be made unless the same shall have first been expressly authorized by law," be, and the same is hereby, repealed.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record upon the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, this bill proposes to repeal a proviso contained in the act which created the Hawaii National Park, which provides "that no appropriation for maintenance, supervision, and improvement of said park in excess of \$10,000 annually shall be made unless the same shall have first been expressly authorized by law."

The part of the Hawaii Park where the immediate expenditure of money covered by H. R. 3682, now pending in Congress, is contemplated consists of the active volcanoes on the island of Hawaii.

This park was visited by 41,150 persons during 1923.

Besides the scenic beauties and spectacular features of the volcanoes, they are of great scientific importance.

In order that the park may be made accessible for the interested public, it is necessary to have roads and trails to and through it. Up to this time all road construction has been carried on by the Territorial government. About \$300,000 has been spent by the Territory of Hawaii in the construction of a concrete road connecting the main seaport, Hilo, with the park. This road is 30 miles long and will ultimately cost \$1,000,000.

It is necessary to pass this bill in order to make the money which will be allotted to the Hawaiian Park under H. R. 3682 for the construction of roads and trails within the park available.

The Secretary of the Interior approves the passage of the bill, and a letter addressed to the chairman of the committee is made a part of this report.

Inasmuch as the Territory of Hawaii donated the land for the Hawaii Park after acquiring same from private owners and has expended a considerable amount of money in opening and developing same, your committee feels that all obstacles to the fullest cooperation between the United States Government and the Territory of Hawaii should be removed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, March 6, 1924.

Hon. N. J. SINNOTT,

Chairman Committee on the Public Lands,
House of Representatives, United States.

MY DEAR MR. SINNOTT: I have your request of February 23 for report on H. R. 4985, entitled "A bill to repeal the first proviso of section 4 of an act to establish a national park in the Territory of Hawaii," approved August 1, 1916.

This measure proposes to repeal a proviso contained in the organic act creating the Hawaii National Park, which provides "that no appropriation for the maintenance, supervision, and improvement of said park in excess of \$10,000 annually shall be made unless the same shall have first been expressly authorized by law."

There is now pending before Congress H. R. 3682, a bill authorizing a three-year program of road construction in the national parks and monuments under the jurisdiction of this department, contemplating an expenditure of \$7,500,000 over the three-year period. This measure was submitted to Congress in accordance with the rules of the Bureau of the Budget, and I have been advised that the contemplated expendi-

ture is not in conflict with the President's financial program. Hearings on this measure have been held just recently by your committee.

This general road program as presented to the committee in detail provides for an allotment of \$260,000 for road construction in Hawaii National Park, and should the authorization be made by Congress and appropriations later made, under existing law, the road work in Hawaii National Park could not be undertaken. For this reason it is essential that the limitation on appropriations be repealed.

In this connection it should be stated that since 1916 the Federal aid road bills have not carried any funds for Territorial roads. At the present time the Territory is building a concrete road from the port of Hilo on the island of Hawaii toward the park on which there has already been expended in the neighborhood of \$300,000 and the total cost of which will be \$1,000,000. The Hawaii National Park, because of its scientific interest and importance and because of its spectacular features, is receiving a heavier travel each year and its development by roads should be undertaken in connection with this road program. I have, therefore, to recommend this bill to the favorable consideration of your committee.

Very truly yours,

HUBERT WORK.

DAIRY BUREAU IN THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The next business was the bill (H. R. 7113) to establish a dairy bureau in the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, at the present time the consumers of the country pay about \$4,000,000,000 per year for dairy products. It is very important that there should be an organization of this kind in the Department of Agriculture. In connection with this I have had prepared by the Department of Agriculture a table of statistics showing the exports of canned milk and evaporated milk last year, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Record by including that table at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The table referred to is as follows:

Exports of milk from the United States, 1923, as compiled from Monthly Export Report issued by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, U. S. Department of Agriculture (pounds)

Exports to—	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	Total
Belgium.....	8,400	7,800		18,900									34,600
France.....	8,400	24,000	46,200	42,000	134,400	66,200	21,000		168,000	154,200	126,000	21,600	811,400
Germany.....	4,343	31,872	125,132	41,022	154,810	82,914	969	14,933	15,433	218,816	331,543	422,555	1,444,342
Latvia.....													
Netherlands.....			48,140	101,400	93,000								242,540
Russia in Europe.....	69,890		78,795	164,788			143,000						446,473
Turkey in Europe.....					2,100								2,100
Ukraine.....						188,042							188,042
United Kingdom.....	271,475	236,400	204,953	26,060	76,500	37,800	81,000		81,900	102,900	60,326	16,800	1,226,114
Panama.....	42,649	170,184	45,159	90,768	40,620	19,545	46,630	191,136	188,496	61,150	80,580	152,016	1,008,741
Mexico.....	89,654	74,628	59,468	60,764	109,366	64,875	157,709	102,086	181,471	107,353	62,793	129,773	1,208,910
Jamaica.....	19,702	8,912	19,500	31,140	72,453	46,970	18,580	10,710	9,970	22,230	27,630	241,020	528,817
Cuba.....	1,709,324	1,354,313	1,473,292	1,513,988	2,583,974	1,941,181	1,799,175	1,986,146	2,174,689	2,735,546	3,212,923	2,302,737	24,987,288
Brazil.....	15,828	20,886	32,408	19,284	24,500	13,152	32,784	25,920	62,766	28,032		25,440	300,800
Peru.....	5,821	5,715	12,498	31,656	40,626	19,826	44,701	29,019	48,066	44,247	11,349	51,729	344,942
British India.....	420	2,100	8,400	4,270	2,100	8,300	10,500	5,945	2,100	14,850	10,028	8,476	75,487
Straits Settlements.....	3,900		2,400	218,444	130,770	70,800	53,724	36,000	113,400	37,800			776,838
China.....	113,400	176,685	409,500	20,220		8,400	10,458	228,600	151,320	400,080	656,996	423,800	2,590,439
Other Dutch East Indies.....		25,200	21,150		19,080		14,670	21,538	31,748	25,500	9,870	8,460	183,208
Hongkong.....	42,000	168,000	244,000	345,621	207,586	84,000	168,000	277,490	84,000	284,004	404,754	192,000	2,550,805
Japan.....	750,992	274,350	824,254	423,735	406,515	685,800	100,848	584,556	671,734	258,152	676,220	349,152	6,156,578
Philippine Islands.....	17,640	59,000	85,640	169,221	282,534	661,176	999,084	443,946	714,252	403,748	539,700	235,510	4,896,251
British South Africa.....	42,000	129,150	444,400	637,779	437,725	291,000	274,150	36,000	32,500		145,145	139,000	2,098,849
Other countries.....	356,566	246,088	465,549	683,934	622,858	295,513	406,392	362,447	367,978	222,273	416,105	489,708	4,935,411
Total.....													57,378,043

EVAPORATED

Belgium.....	148,200	124,400	302,400	522,800	287,032	223,920	288,000	106,500	435,360	895,975	1,453,819	2,066,574	6,865,940
France.....	641,700	112,641	777,720	800,640	950,400	642,000	626,400	418,800	950,400	1,315,210	1,802,184	1,372,272	10,376,367
Germany.....	1,242,783	391,295	3,252,240	4,141,801	2,987,501	991,816	155,613	25,263	845,358	1,865,637	3,346,627	10,510,845	29,756,839
Latvia.....	480,000	1,755,840	5,150,016	2,435,616									9,821,472
Netherlands.....				240,000	238,000	464,204	60,000			466,800	1,117,960	2,782,375	5,299,039
Russia in Europe.....			534,870	426,864									961,734
Turkey in Europe.....				80,800	67,200	50,000							198,000
Ukraine.....		1,732,752			26,271								1,759,023
United Kingdom.....	2,410,992	2,784,634	1,764,102	1,705,856	2,624,156	1,185,496	1,795,647	3,644,637	3,264,888	4,250,859	3,997,692	4,265,619	33,643,978
Panama.....	300,559	652,150	162,862	514,080	338,851	122,791	235,020	236,370	530,974	235,148	304,940	331,416	3,960,161
Mexico.....	210,327	256,320	214,281	281,317	267,302	268,489	242,003	144,604	203,402	232,003	302,517	101,116	2,723,681
Jamaica.....	9,708	10,496	22,927	19,968	13,740	10,105	6,750	1,920	6,815	1,680	1,872	7,200	113,181
Cuba.....	353,809	182,546	260,123	406,082	131,024	137,716	260,555	263,866	287,456	375,460	345,531	330,484	3,334,652
Peru.....	31,952	223,840	183,240	473,510	634,009	530,978	425,153	469,340	521,037	276,583	403,942	610,716	4,684,000
British India.....	132,814	81,022	55,638	47,905	52,119	38,540	60,940	60,606	36,780	36,569	87,630	89,940	780,803
Straits Settlements.....	123,256	170,372	220,720	53,210	92,620	185,210	234,006	64,791	61,722	171,541	97,176	112,107	1,587,081
China.....	12,480	47,586	218,629	93,138	117,825	378,862	287,056	147,984	528,120	211,680	433,700	175,961	2,652,991
Other Dutch East Indies.....	46,600	42,480	52,836	64,960	65,550		25,920	19,630	46,800	75,000	27,280	7,200	460,506
Hongkong.....	62,154	43,200	25,264	41,280	115,148	173,408	114,770		159,690	36,000	135,860	32,420	929,484
Japan.....	45,596	32,172	158,049	45,724	245,689	83,628	151,893	113,089	536,550	238,772	25,230	34,733	1,798,825
Philippine Islands.....	119,124	831,872	926,200	636,800	617,920	439,396	784,080	471,632	472,604	1,124,060	936,200	877,200	7,526,688
British South Africa.....	64,414	10,172	4,800	38,940		6,000		23,650	36,450		32,000	6,800	222,726
Other countries.....	396,559	654,473	797,829	508,760	494,253	1,141,578	492,239	427,162	443,630	576,373	490,993	916,558	7,340,407
Total.....													136,886,323

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby established in the Department of Agriculture a bureau to be known as the bureau of dairying.

SEC. 2. That a chief of the bureau of dairying shall be appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture, who shall be subject to the general direction of the Secretary of Agriculture. He shall devote his time to the investigation of the dairy industry, and the dissemination of information for the promotion of the dairy industry.

SEC. 3. For the purpose of enabling the Secretary of Agriculture and the chief of the bureau of dairying to carry out the purposes of this act, the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to transfer to the bureau of dairying such activities of the Department of Agriculture as he may designate which relate primarily to the dairy industry, and to employ such additional persons in the city of Washington and elsewhere, as may be necessary.

SEC. 4. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act and the activities of the bureau of dairying, such sums of money as Congress may deem necessary are hereby authorized to be appropriated, in addition to such sums provided for in the Agricultural appropriation act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925.

SEC. 5. That this act shall be in full force and effect on and after July 1, 1924.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word. I am going to take only half a minute. I want to say that if this had been a bill for the creation of a bureau for any other interest except the farming interests of the country I would have objected to it, because we ought to stop creating

these bureaus. This bureau is going to require another \$7,500 chief and all the incidental expenses, but as it is for the farmers of the country I shall let it go by.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

AMENDING THE PENAL CODE OF THE UNITED STATES

The next business was the bill (H. R. 5946) to amend section 84 of the Penal Code of the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a similar Senate bill (S. 2146) will be substituted.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 84 of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States," approved March 4, 1909 (34 Stat. p. 1088), be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"Sec. 84. Whoever shall hunt, trap, capture, willfully disturb, or kill any bird or wild animal of any kind whatever, or take or destroy the eggs of any such bird on any lands of the United States which have been set apart or reserved as refuges or breeding grounds for such birds or animals by any law, proclamation, or Executive order, except under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture may from time to time prescribe, or who shall willfully injure, molest, or destroy any property of the United States on any such lands, shall be fined not more than \$500 or imprisoned not more than six months, or both."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A similar House bill (H. R. 5946) was laid on the table.

TICK-INFESTED CATTLE

The next business was the bill (H. R. 5791) to repeal that part of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912," approved March 4, 1911, relating to the admission of tick-infested cattle from Mexico into Texas.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, why admit tick-infested cattle when the Agricultural appropriation bill, about to come up, carries, as I understand it, a large appropriation to fight the tick?

Mr. HAUGEN. This is to prohibit the importation.

Mr. BEGG. That is all right.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BEGG. As I read it, it was to remove the restriction.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection. Without objection, the Senate bill will be considered instead of the House bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (S. 2164) to repeal that part of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912," approved March 4, 1911, relating to the admission of tick-infested cattle from Mexico into Texas.

Be it enacted, etc., That that part of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912," approved March 4, 1911 (36 Stat. L. p. 1240), which amended the act of August 30, 1890, so as to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture under joint regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Treasury to permit the admission of tick-infested cattle from Mexico into that part of Texas below the southern quarantine line, be, and the same is hereby, repealed.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

WILLOW CREEK RANGER STATION, MONT.

The next bill on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 5941) to complete the construction of the Willow Creek Ranger Station, Mont.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture the necessity for this bill?

Mr. HAUGEN. The construction is authorized, and on account of the increased prices the estimated cost additional to complete is \$300, but to be on the safe side it is suggested it be made \$500.

Mr. BLANTON. Five hundred dollars for what?

Mr. HAUGEN. To complete.

Mr. BLANTON. With the total of \$500?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. In other words this bill will not cost but \$500, to be taken out of the Treasury?

Mr. HAUGEN. No; the estimate is \$300, but in order to play safe we have asked for \$500.

Mr. BLANTON. The total amount of money that is going to come out of the Treasury is \$500?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes; that is the total.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. Without objection a similar Senate bill will be considered. The Chair hears no objection. The Clerk will report the Senate bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (S. 2147) to complete the construction of the Willow Creek Ranger Station, Mont.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to expend, out of any moneys appropriated for general expenses of the Forest Service, not to exceed the sum of \$500 to complete the construction of the Willow Creek ranger station in the Lewis and Clark National Forest, Mont.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A similar House bill was ordered to lie on the table.

EXTENDING INVITATIONS TO GOVERNMENTS TO PARTICIPATE IN WORLD POULTRY CONGRESS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was House Joint Resolution 189, authorizing the President to extend invitations to foreign governments to participate in a World's Poultry Congress.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not know what kind of ridiculous invitations we are going to extend hereafter to European nations. We are going to have them come over here on the subject of raising turnip greens, kale, and various other subjects. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe this money ought to be expended, and I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas objects. That completes the bills in order to-day. There is one at the bottom of the page, a bridge bill, which under the rules the Chair thinks might be considered.

Mr. MAPES. I ask unanimous consent that it may be considered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that the bill be considered. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE DETROIT RIVER

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 8084) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across Detroit River within or near the city limits of Detroit, Mich.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. There is a similar Senate bill. Without objection, the Senate bill will be considered in lieu of the House bill.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (S. 2825) to extend the time for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across Detroit River within or near the city limits of Detroit, Mich.

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of the bridge authorized by act of Congress approved March 4, 1921, to be built by the American Transit Co., its successors and assigns, across Detroit River, within or near the city limits of Detroit, Wayne County, Mich., are hereby extended one year and five years, respectively, from the date of approval hereof.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a similar House bill will lie upon the table.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair finds that by inadvertence earlier in the day two House bills were passed similar to two

Senate bills. Without objection, the proceedings whereby H. R. 4319, authorizing the conveyance of certain land to the city of Miles City, State of Montana, for park purposes, and H. R. 3756, granting to the county of Custer, State of Montana, certain land in said county for use as a fairground, were passed will be vacated and the House bills laid upon the table, and S. 303, authorizing the conveyance of certain land to the city of Miles City, State of Montana, for park purposes, and S. 306, granting to the county of Custer, State of Montana, certain land in said county for use as a fairground, will be considered, read twice, ordered read a third time, read a third time, and passed. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FUTURE OF LAND RECLAMATION

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the reclamation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, this Congress has before it numerous problems of national and international importance, many of which are of great interest to the country generally, as well as from the standpoint of good citizenship. Among these questions there is perhaps none more vitally important, as it relates to the stability of government and of business institution than that of the national policy of land reclamation and settlement. From the earliest times the land question has been recognized as fundamental in the stability of all government; in fact, one of the most difficult questions, and one which threatened the existence of the Nation as a whole, was that growing out of the ownership and use of the vast tracts of land west of the original Colonies. When the title to these lands was finally confirmed in the United States, then and not until then was the stability of the Union assured.

The necessity of using these public lands for homes for citizens was early appreciated, but the ways of assuring the best use were not finally agreed upon until the passage of the homestead act, which in effect practically dedicated to home making the greater part of the public lands of the country. The growth of the United States in population, industry, and in everything which makes for good citizenship has been closely connected with the utilization of the vast extent of lands which could be employed in the creation of the small self-supporting farm homes; small in distinction from the great estates or ranches of other countries, but which are large enough to absorb the available labor of the owner and his family.

The fact that these public lands, suitable for home making, had practically disappeared by the beginning of this century, led the late President Theodore Roosevelt and his associates to urge that the benefits of the homestead act be extended by removing obstacles to the cultivation of lands which were then lying idle because of lack of water. In his first message to Congress, December, 1901, President Roosevelt urged that the public lands of the arid region be reclaimed so that homesteading might continue. Under the stimulus of his personal interest in the matter and with the active efforts of many notable statesmen, the reclamation act finally became a law, being signed by President Roosevelt on June 17 (Bunker Hill Day), 1902.

Two decades have elapsed since that time. The vacant public lands, so far as these may be irrigated or reclaimed, have practically all disappeared. Although about 190,000,000 acres of vacant public lands remain on the tract books of the Land Office, practically all of these consist of rejected areas of mountains, of plateaus, or rock-strewn valleys, and lands where the soil is too thin for cultivation. Every valley in the arid region has been explored, every piece of land which, under any conceivable plan, may ultimately be utilized is gone so far as Government reclamation is concerned.

The extraordinary and unlooked for success of the reclamation act has resulted in a great stimulus of enterprise in the arid region as a whole, and to an extent such as to force land prices so high, as compared with recent crop values, as to render further reclamation plans a matter for serious consideration from the financial or economic standpoint.

It is not to be inferred that the West is completely developed. On the contrary, we are at the beginning of development, but we must go at it in some other way than has been practiced in the past. This is shown by the many applications for relief from payment of the installments due the Government. This is in spite of the fact that the conditions for such payment for water for the reclaimed land have been made, by act of Congress, more lenient than in any other part of the world or by

any other country or organization. Last year 2,000 people applied for relief or extension of time of payment and this year over 4,500 are urging some concession. Many of these claims are doubtless meritorious, but the fact that so many people are making application indicates that there must be some change in present methods.

It must not be assumed that the West, which has contained such vast areas of public land, is the only undeveloped portion of the United States. The country as a whole, as concerns its continued growth and prosperity, can not confine its efforts to any one section. A self-supporting home established in the East is as important to the Nation as one in the West. It is the contented and prosperous home which should be considered, not the particular locality of that home.

This important consideration that the Nation is concerned, not with the reclamation of public lands because they are public lands but with the ultimate object of home making gives a broad view of the situation. It forces us to consider the opportunities offered in every part of the country. For many years the people of the South have been insistent that so far as national and business stability are concerned it is the unused land of the South which should have early consideration. They have claimed that with the rapid development of the West the South now presents more opportunities. There are no public lands remaining in the South.

The existence of public lands should not be made the prerequisite for the continuation of the national policy of home making. On the contrary, this policy should be adapted to present conditions of landownership and be so modified as to encourage the settlement of vast tracts of land suitable for home making.

There is no doubt but that the success of reclamation in the West has stimulated other parts of the country to demand that equal consideration be given to their claims. It is a matter of history that when the reclamation act was under consideration the South voted to help the West and with the understanding that if the time should come that the South was in a position to need similar legislation the western men would come to its aid.

The time has now arrived when the people of the South are demanding such consideration and are pointing to the fact that if the ultimate object of the reclamation act is the making of homes, then under present conditions homes can be made in the South as well as in the West.

To put it in another way, the success of national reclamation in the arid region has stimulated interest and enthusiasm in the underlying ideals of home making; and if the West is to continue with Federal assistance, it must share this with other parts of the country. It can no longer stand alone or claim the unique distinction of having public land to be reclaimed in any considerable tracts.

This claim for general consideration is by no means new. Congress has already recognized that something should be done, and in 1918 appropriated \$100,000 for a study of the unused lands in every State. The report printed in 1919 illustrates the fact that there are lands available in every section of the country, many of which may be utilized as need arises. It is true that these lands are in private ownership, individual or corporate, but they can be obtained on terms not much more onerous than those attached to public lands; that is to say, the owners of many of these tracts, seeing the hopelessness of financial gain in the reclamation and settlement of these lands, have offered to turn over these areas to bona fide settlers at rates which may be approved by competent authority as being fair.

It is possible to conceive of a land reclamation and settlement district, organized under the State law, embracing suitable lands and conducted in such way as to give reasonable assurance to homeseekers that they will have a square deal. It is also possible to conceive that the financing of such districts may be done under Federal auspices in such way as will ultimately recover the investment, although the interest may be lost to the Government during the years of pioneering. Compensation for this loss of interest is more than made up by the fact of the ultimate settlement of the land and the making of self-supporting homes. It is recognized that in every undertaking of this kind some aid must be given; the most effective way is through this forfeiting of interest on the investment during these early stages.

IMPROVEMENT OF EXISTING LAW

The reclamation law as it now stands is applicable only to lands in the 17 arid or semiarid Western States—Kansas to California, Montana to Arizona. It has been amended from time to time in certain details, particularly those having to do

with the repayment of the amount owed to the Government on account of the capital investment in irrigation and drainage works. The result is that the law as a whole is more or less of a patchwork; it is somewhat inconsistent in its details and requires for effective application many fine-drawn distinctions or inferences, which should be covered by explicit statement of principles. In short, the methods of administration forced by the necessities of the case are not embodied in the law, but are permissible by inferences drawn from apparent intent of the act, rather than from direct authorization.

This latitude of the reclamation law was very desirable and even essential 20 years ago when conditions were almost unknown, but now that Federal reclamation has become an established fact it is the part of wisdom for Congress to recognize the larger needs and to place responsibilities more definitely than in the past.

RECLAMATION DISTRICTS

The formation of reclamation districts under State law is one of the large steps in advance in the carrying out of the objects of the reclamation act. These districts should be encouraged or even compelled to take a larger responsibility in the administration of affairs, not leaving the landowners and their tenants to shift the burdens of operation and maintenance to the shoulders of Uncle Sam. The reclamation act in its very essence requires that large responsibility be assumed by the Federal department or bureau having the matter in charge, but the duties have been greatly increased by this strongly marked tendency to force good-natured Uncle Sam to carry the burden longer and to a larger extent than was contemplated originally.

Under the act of 1902 it was assumed that payments would be made without interest during the pioneer period of 10 years, and that before this time had elapsed the local people would have assumed full responsibility and control. Congress extended the time to 20 years, but made no requirements such as to facilitate the Government laying down the burden. Recently a provision was inserted in one of the appropriation acts which may require the Government, in connection with the Milk River project, Montana, to keep control and to practically peddle out water for 40 years. It is thus forced to interfere in the local affairs of water distribution to small communities, a condition which tends to continued misunderstanding and exasperation. We must get over this and go back more nearly to the original conception—that if the Government initiates the work and puts it on its feet, there must be some organization or district acting under State law which must take up the petty details of dealing with the individuals.

EXTENSION OF TIME

In connection with the operation of the reclamation act, there is no one thing which has taken up so much time of Congress, and in its committees, and has led to such exasperation on the part of all concerned, as is the steadily increasing demand for extension of time of payment. At the end of the first 10 years Congress concluded that a 10-year period for payment of the capital invested in the water, which made the farm available, was too short, even though this payment was made without interest. After considerable discussion it was concluded to grant terms so easy that under no possible condition could any landowner fail to make good; that is to say, to make the installments on the capital invested less than the ordinary payment of interest. For example, the Government may have invested \$80 per acre in the reclamation of land. This land was given away originally under condition of settlement. The man getting this piece of land was required to pay this \$80 for the water in installments without interest, extending over a period of 20 years.

To put it in another way, if the landowner paid 5 per cent a year for 20 years he could have the water for nothing. More than this, to cover the pioneer period, it is provided that for the first four years the landowner need pay only 2 per cent installments, then for the fifth and sixth years only 4 per cent installments, and for the remaining 14 years 6 per cent, all of these without interest on the deferred amount. Here were terms far easier than those offered by any county or community, and Congress gave a sigh of relief that the whole thing was settled and for all time. Many Members thought this too easy and urged that at least a small interest charge should be demanded and conditions after the first 10 years made comparable to those of the Federal farm-loan banks.

Now, however, after a few years of payment of the installments on the capital invested of 2 per cent, thousands of landowners plead that they can not keep up this rate of installments. Last year 2,000 appealed for relief. This year over twice as many. There is no doubt but that many of the settlers do need help, on account of excessive cost of the project, poor soil, small

yield, and so forth, but those unfriendly to the reclamation policy argue that the beneficiaries under the reclamation act should be required to meet their payments or accept terms comparable to those of the Federal farm loan act, amortizing the debt in from 30 to 40 years, but with payment of a small interest, equivalent to the amount the taxpayers are carrying on money borrowed by the Government.

The annual relief bills will probably come before Congress as long as there remains any debt to the United States, unless some general rule should be laid down consistent with sound business principles, and the Commissioner of the Reclamation Service or a board shall be given the power and duty to establish regulations for adjustment of payments after a thorough investigation has been made of the necessities of the settlers on the different projects and to see that these regulations are carried out in a spirit of fairness.

COOPERATION BETWEEN STATE AND NATION

One of the chief criticisms of the reclamation act is that it is too one-sided. The Federal Government is furnishing all the money, doing all the work, is being criticized because it does not enter into more details, while the State is doing little or nothing in the way of solving the problems of its citizens on the reclaimed lands.

Undoubtedly there will be better appreciation of the work done by the Government if much of this is made contingent upon the performance of equally important functions which fall within the State jurisdiction. For example, the selection of settlers, the getting of the reclamation lands into the hands of men who will actually use them, the providing of advice in the way of better crop production—all of such work and many other details should be handled to a larger extent by the State or State organizations, farm bureaus, and others. The National Government should be in a position to deal with the State or municipality organized under State laws and not be put in the position of supervising the details of water distribution to thousands of farms.

In particular, the financing of the settler is a matter which should be taken up by the State. Under present conditions the landowners must borrow considerable sums of money on which they are paying 8, 10, and 12 per cent, a rate which it is impossible to continue for any considerable time without injury. There are many arguments why, if the Federal Government will provide the water, the State or its subdivisions should give proper attention to these financial needs.

TAXES

In addition to the heavy interest charges for which relief should be afforded, there are the steadily increasing taxes which are piled on the back-breaking load of the irrigator. Remember that the greater part of the taxes is of local origin—State and county. These taxes are under local control and yet they have increased with such rapidity that many an otherwise well-to-do farmer has been compelled to give up, the taxes representing a proper margin of profit.

The reason for this heavy taxation is evident in that on the reclaimed areas the people in the towns especially have demanded the conveniences of a highly settled community. They are building roads, bridges, schools, and public buildings surpassing those of communities which have been settled for a hundred years. They are trying to pay for these things in a few years. All of them are desirable, some are necessary; but more necessary is it to keep the taxes within the limits where they can be paid.

A VISION OF THE FUTURE

In what I have said I have tried to point out the things which should be done, and it might be inferred that, because I have pointed these things out they are the large features of reclamation. On the contrary, while important they are not the whole story. I have not taken time to amplify upon the advantages and the great opportunities which lie before us in the future. I am merely pointing out the bad places in the road. At the same time the road does lead through pleasant valleys and has great attractions. It leads to far better conditions than I have touched upon. We are only at the beginning of land reclamation. We will realize even more largely than in the past the vision of the men who work for reclamation and the making of farm homes. We will ultimately achieve these, but we can do so more quickly and more satisfactorily to all concerned if we consider the rough spots and smooth them out.

The country as a whole not only needs more opportunities for homes but can provide these opportunities to be taken up in an orderly manner as needed when we make use of the experience we have had in the last 20 years. By utilizing that experience and by doing some of the things which I have de-

scribed we will be performing not only a necessary duty but one which will redound to the peace and prosperity of the whole Nation.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the Cotter Dam.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

SALE OF WINE AND BEER

Mr. TAYLOR of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR of West Virginia. I do this for the purpose of reading a telegram, which is as follows:

CHARLESTON, W. VA., April 5, 1924.

Representative J. ALFRED TAYLOR,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Commending you on your noble stand for the right, 400 members of Charleston W. C. T. U. ask your support of H. R. 728; also H. R. 6645. We ask a special protest on the floor of the House against any measure legalizing wine and beer. The sixth district and the State are behind you when you say they shall not pass.

Mrs. W. A. RADFORD, Corresponding Secretary.

I make this solemn protest here now, and I hope to make it more effectually if any bill legalizing the sale of wine and beer is ever brought up for passage.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. GIBSON (at the request of Mr. FLEETWOOD), for one week, on account of illness in his family.

To Mr. HUDSON (at the request of Mr. MAPES), for three days, on account of important business.

To Mr. WELSH, for three days, on account of death in his family.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. ROSENBLOOM, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 3682. An act authorizing the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of roads and trails, inclusive of necessary bridges, in the national parks and monuments under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior;

H. R. 593. An act authorizing the issuance of service medals to officers and enlisted men of the two brigades of Texas Cavalry organized under authority from the War Department under date of December 8, 1917, and authorizing an appropriation therefor, and further authorizing the wearing by such officers and enlisted men, on occasions of ceremony, of the uniform lawfully prescribed to be worn by them during their service; and

H. R. 2876. An act to provide for the payment of claims of Chippewa Indians of Minnesota for back annuities.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned, in accordance with the order previously made, until to-morrow, Tuesday, April 8, 1924, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

428. Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting copy of letter of the Major General Commandant, United States Marine Corps, dated March 5, 1924, forwarding list of useless records on file in headquarters, United States Marine Corps, and copy of letter of the Bureau of Navigation, dated March 20, 1924, requesting authority to destroy useless individual weekly drill reports pertaining to various drilling organizations of the Naval Reserve Force, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. LAMPERT: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 7962. A bill to create and establish a commission, as an independent establishment of the Federal Government, to

regulate rents in the District of Columbia; with amendments (Rept. No. 467). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GASQUE: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 6628. A bill to change the name of Jewett Street west of Wisconsin Avenue to Cathedral Avenue; without amendment (Rept. No. 468). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. BOYLAN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 1332. A bill for the relief of Dennis Shevlin; with an amendment (Rept. No. 469). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3257) making eligible for retirement under certain conditions officers of the Army of the United States, other than officers of the Regular Army, who incurred physical disability in line of duty while in the service of the United States during the World War; Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

A bill (H. R. 8301) granting an increase of pension to Byron W. Jacks; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. TILLMAN: A bill (H. R. 8487) to establish the Peel National Military Park at the Pea Ridge battle field in Benton County, Ark.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8488) to authorize the Federal Power Commission to amend permit No. 1, project No. 1, issued to the Dixie Power Co.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 8489) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Spencer, W. Va.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WARD of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 8490) to authorize the erection of a public building at Ahoskie, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. COOPER of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 8491) to regulate the shipment of firearms in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LAZARO: A bill (H. R. 8492) to revive the right of action under the act of March 12, 1863 (12 Stat. L. p. 820); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 8493) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and enter judgment in any claims which the Stockbridge Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 8494) providing for care of graves of British soldiers in Greenwood Cemetery, Fort Worth, Tex.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SINNOTT: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 237) directing the Secretary of the Interior to withhold his approval of the adjustment of the Northern Pacific land grants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BURTON: Resolution (H. Res. 251) appropriating additional funds for the select committee appointed under the provisions of H. Res. 217, adopted March 12, 1924; to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALMON: A bill (H. R. 8495) granting a pension to Arthur E. Palmer; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 8496) granting a pension to Mrs. Rea Ingersoll; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8497) granting a pension to Isabel D. Mann; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8498) for the relief of Harry L. Rogers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BEERS: A bill (H. R. 8499) granting a pension to Elizabeth C. Pearson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BULWINKLE: A bill (H. R. 8500) granting a pension to James M. Peterson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURDICK: A bill (H. R. 8501) to provide additional compensation for Frank J. Viti; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 8502) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Savage, State of Minnesota, two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8503) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Winthrop, State of Minnesota, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOWELL: A bill (H. R. 8504) granting an increase of pension to Martha A. McNeer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FISH: A bill (H. R. 8505) for the relief of Capt. Norman D. Cota; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 8506) granting a pension to Matilda Bittner; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LYON: A bill (H. R. 8507) authorizing the Secretary of War to make a survey of South River, N. C.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MCKENZIE: A bill (H. R. 8508) for the relief of Luis Rosario and Jose M. Caballero; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MERRITT: A bill (H. R. 8509) granting an increase of pension to Lida M. Osborn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 8510) granting an increase of pension to Rachel L. Herbert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SEARS of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 8511) granting a pension to Mrs. John Petty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 8512) granting an increase of pension to Mary Longto; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 8513) for the relief of W. S. Wakeman; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8514) for the relief of J. I. Richardson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WILSON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 8515) granting a pension to Della Elder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8516) granting a pension to John S. Nixon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8517) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Stallings; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2215. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of the American Legion, Department of Massachusetts, urging Congress to make adequate provision for the care, treatment, comfort, and entertainment of disabled veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

2216. By Mr. ANDREW: Petition of the executive committee of the Massachusetts Department of the American Legion, urging Congress to make full and adequate provision for the care, treatment, comfort, and entertainment of disabled veterans and orphan children of disabled veterans before making provision for foreign relief of any nature, with special reference to the German relief bill; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2217. By Mr. ARNOLD: Petition of various citizens of Willow Hill, Ill., asking that the Johnson immigration bill be enacted into law; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2218. By Mr. BARBOUR: Petition of residents of Tulare County, Calif., protesting against a modification of the Volstead Act and the recognizing of 2.75 per cent beer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2219. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Greater Boston Chapter, Military Order of the World War, Boston, Mass., condemning the action of the House of Representatives for passing an appropriation of \$10,000,000 for the relief of German children; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2220. By Mr. LINEBERGER: Petition of L. A. Sutton and others with reference to House bill 2702; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

2221. By Mr. MORROW: Petition of Jugoslavijska Lodge, Frank Lukancic, secretary, of Sugarite, N. Mex., opposing the

present immigration proposals; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2222. By Mr. PHILLIPS: Petition of Roundhead Camp, Sons of Veterans, No. 165, of Ellwood City, Pa., urging the immediate passage of the Johnson immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2223. Also, petition of Wampum Council, No. 181, Fraternal Patriotic Americans, of Wampum Pa., urging the passage of the Johnson immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2224. Also, petition of Ellwood City Council, No. 182, Fraternal Patriotic Americans, of Ellwood City, Pa., urging the passage of the Johnson immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2225. By Mr. ROBINSON of Iowa: Petition of citizens of Dubuque, Iowa, advising support and enactment into law of the Johnson immigration bill, based on the census of 1890; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2226. By Mr. ROUSE: Petition of citizens of Latonia and Covington, Kenton County, Ky., indorsing the immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2227. By Mr. SHALLENBERGER: Petition of citizens of Franklin County, Nebr., favoring House bill 4081; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2228. By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of the department executive committee of the American Legion, urging Congress to provide adequate comfort and entertainment for disabled veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

SENATE

TUESDAY, April 8, 1924

(Legislative day of Monday, April 7, 1924)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock m., on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Edwards	King	Shields
Ball	Fernald	Ladd	Shipstead
Bayard	Ferris	McCormick	Shortridge
Borah	Fess	McKellar	Simmons
Brandeggee	Fletcher	McKinley	Smith
Broussard	Frazier	McNary	Smoot
Bruce	George	Mayfield	Spencer
Bursum	Gerry	Neely	Stanfield
Cameron	Glass	Norris	Stephens
Capper	Gooding	Oddie	Sterling
Caraway	Hale	Overman	Swanson
Colt	Harrell	Owen	Trammell
Copeland	Harris	Pepper	Underwood
Couzens	Harrison	Philpps	Wadsworth
Cummins	Heflin	Pittman	Walsh, Mass.
Curtis	Howell	Ralston	Walsh, Mont.
Dale	Johnson, Minn.	Ransdell	Warren
Dial	Jones, N. Mex.	Reed, Pa.	Watson
Dill	Kendrick	Robinson	Weller
Edge	Keyes	Sheppard	Willis

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] is absent on account of illness.

I was requested to announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are attending a hearing before a special investigating committee of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF NEAL DOW

Mr. FERNALD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD an address of the Hon. WESLEY L. JONES of Washington, delivered in Portland, Me., on Sunday, March 23, at the services in commemoration of the one hundred and twentieth anniversary of the birth of Neal Dow.

I ask to have printed also the letter of the Hon. Percival P. Baxter, Governor of Maine, which was read at this service.

In the RECORD of March 20 a letter appeared, addressed to Hon. WESLEY L. JONES, by Arthur C. Jackson, president of the Neal Dow Association for World Peace and Prohibition, and inviting the attention of Congress to the purposes of this organization as formulated in its brief constitution. The consti-